DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 363 358 IR 054 814

AUTHOR	D'Elia, George
TITLE	The Roles of the Public Library in Society: The Results of a National Survey. Final Report [and] Appendix.
INSTITUTION	Gallup Organization, Inc., Princeton, N.J.; Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Carlson School of Management.; Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Center for Survey Research.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	93
CONTRACT	R039A10030
NOTE	488p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Urban Libraries Council, 1800 Ridge Avenue, Suite 208, Evanston, IL 60201.
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF02/PC20 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adults; Attitudes; Blacks; Children; *Community Leaders; Comparative Analysis; Demography; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Hispanic Americans; *Library Role; Library Services; National Surveys; *Public Libraries; *Public Opinion; Questionnaires; Tables (Data); *User Needs (Information); Use Studies; Whites
IDENTIFIERS	African Americans

ABSTRACT

National samples of the general public (n=1,001) and community opinion leaders (n=300) were asked to evaluate the importance to their communities of 10 different roles of the public library. Respondents evaluated each role in terms of its importance to their communities. Survey results indicate that the public library's roles to support the educational aspirations of the community in general and the learning/discovery needs of preschoolers, students, and adult independent learners in perticular were evaluated most highly by the general public and community opinion leaders. Subsequent national surveys of African Americans (n=401) and Hispanic Americans (n=399) enabled comparison with a subsample of Caucasian Americans (n=846) and demonstrated the highest percentages of "very important" responses for all three groups for the three educational roles of the public library. All groups suggested levels of support for libraries that were well above the actual national median in 1990. Detailed comparisons of the role evaluations by the various demographic groups within each of the samples are presented to enable libraries or branches to generate a tentative set of roles based on its community demographics. These findings are presented in 123 tables. A separately bound appendix describes survey methodology, presents the questionnaire, and contains the frequency distributions for the responses from each survey. (SLD)

ED 363 358

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

IR054814

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This project (R039A10030) was supported by a grant from Library Programs, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under the Library Research and Demonstration Program of the Higher Education Act, Title II-B. The contents of this report do not reflect the policy nor do they carry the endorsement of the U.S. Department of Education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many agencies and people were involved in the successful completion of this project. The author is indebted to ...

the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Library Programs for funding this project under the Library Research and Demonstration Program of the Higher Education Act, Title II-B. The author is particularly indebted to Yvonne Carter who, as the Program Officer in charge of this project, provided guidance and support that were essential to the completion of the project;

his collaborators at the University of Minnesota Center for Survey Research, most especially to Rosanna Armson, Director, and Lisa Peterson, Data Manager, and at The Gallup Organization, most especially to Max Larsen, Director of Government and Education Research, and Elaine Christiansen, Project Director;

the members of the Advisory Committee for the project who provided the guidance and critical assessments necessary to keep the project on track. The Committee included Kathleen Balcom, Director of the Arlington Heights [IL] Public Library; Susan Goldberg, Director of the Minneapolis [MN] Public Library and Information Center; Martin Gomez, Director of the Oakland [CA] Public Library; Sheldon Kaye, Director of the Portland [ME] Public Library; Samuel Morrison, Director of the Broward County [FL] Public Library; Amy Owen, Director of the Utah State Library Division; and Carole Williams, Public Services Manager, Saint Paul [MN] Public Library;

Eleanor Jo Rodger, President of the Urban Libraries Council, who, as consultant to the project, provided a unique blend of advice grounded in research methodology and good management practice; and

my assistants, Susan Brown and Russell Littlefield, doctoral students in the Information and Decision Sciences Department of the Carlson School of Management, and John Pipkin, Word Processing Specialist in the Information and Decision Sciences Department.

While many people contributed to the successful completion of the project, the author accepts sole responsibility for this report and any limitations or deficiencies therein. All interpretations of the data and opinions either expressed or implied are the responsibility of the author.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A national sample of the general public and a national sample of community opinion leaders were asked to evaluate the importance to their communities of ten different roles of the public library. These roles included the public library serving as

a community activities center,

a center for information about the community,

an educational support center for students of all ages,

a learning center for adult independent learners,

a recreational reading center of popular materials and best sellers,

a discovery and learning center for preschool children,

an information center for community businesses,

a general information center for community residents,

a research center for scholars and researchers, and

a comfortable, quiet place where residents could go to read, to think or to work.

The respondents evaluated each role in terms of its importance to their community using the response categories "not important," "slightly important," "moderately important," or "very important."

The percentages of the general public sample (N = 1,001) responding "very important" to each role were (in ranked order): an educational support center for students of all ages (88%), a learning center for adult independent learners (85%), a discovery and learning center for preschool children (83%), a research center for scholars and researchers (68%), a center for community information (66%), an information center for community businesses (55%), a comfortable place for people to read, think or work (52%), a recreational reading center (51%), a general information center for community residents (48%), and a community activities center (41%).

The percentages of the opinion leaders sample (N = 300) responding "very important" to each role were (in ranked order): an educational support center for students of all ages (88%), a discovery and learning center for preschool children (81%), a learning center for adult independent learners (78%), a center for information about the community (65%), a research center for scholars and researchers (56%), a recreational reading center (53%), an information center for community businesses (47%), a community activities center (46%), a general information center for community residents (38%), and a comfortable, quiet place to read, think or work (38%).

The results of these surveys indicate that the public library's roles to support the educational aspirations of the community - for preschoolers, students, and adult independent learners -were evaluated most highly by both the general public and the community opinion leaders.

Subsequent national surveys of African Americans and Hispanic Americans, when combined with the general public poll described above, enabled comparative analyses of the opinions of Caucasian American (N = 846), African American (N = 401) and Hispanic American (N = 399) respondents. The results of these comparisons indicated that among all three groups the highest percentages of "very important" responses occurred for the three educational roles of the public library (vis, the library as an educational support center for students of all ages, a learning center for adult independent learners, and a discovery and learning center for preschool children). Further analyses indicated that there were only minor differences among the three groups in terms of each group's rank ordering of the ten roles from those roles receiving the highest percentages of "very important" to those receiving the lowest percentages of "very important." However, the analyses also indicated that African Americans and Hispanic Americans systematically evaluated each role of the public library more highly than did Caucasian Americans. In evaluating the roles of the library, the Caucasian Americans on average selected the response category "very important" 64% of the time, while the African Americans on average selected the response category "very important" 81% of the time, and the Hispanic Americans on average selected the response category "very important" 78% of the time. In effect, the African American and Hispanic American respondents systematically evaluated the importance of each of the roles of the public library to the community more highly than did the Caucasian American respondents, but all three groups tended to agree about which roles (the educational roles) were most important relative to the other roles.

The respondents in all surveys were also asked their opinion about how much money their communities should spend on library services. The respondents were informed that communities in this country spend from as little as $4.00 per capita to as much as $100 per capita with the national median at $16.00 per capita. Respondents were given a possible range of values from $0 per capita to more than $100 per capita in increments of $20. The average per capita expenditure that respondents thought the community should spend annually on the public library was $39.86 for African Americans, $33.73 for Caucasian Americans, $39.22 for Hispanic Americans, and $41.00 for the community opinion leaders. All of these suggested levels of library support are well above the national median (for 1990) of $16.00 per capita.

Detailed comparisons of the role evaluations by various demographic groups within each of the samples (the national sample, the African American sample, the Caucasian American sample, and the Hispanic American sample) are presented. These demographic comparisons of the data can used to generate a tentative set of roles for a library or even for branches within a library system. For example, a library could begin by identifying the significant service populations of its community based on race, gender, age, education level, size of household, or any of the other demographic characteristics reported in these surveys. For each of these significant service populations (for example, African American households with preschoolers), the library could then identify the roles that are reported in these surveys to be most important to the respondents who represent the service population (for example, the roles that were identified as most important by African American respondents living in households with preschool children). The library could then draw the reasonable inference that the service populations in its community would most likely share the same opinions about the importance of the roles as the respondents in the surveys who represented those service populations. A library could then develop a tentative set of roles for its community that could be tested by a small community survey, or by interviews with representatives of its various service populations, or by town meetings, or by any other method appropriate to local conditions or resources.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT 1

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT 1

THE ROLES OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY 1

PERSONNEL FOR THE PROJECT 2

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT 3
The Roles Questions 3
The Financial Support Question 6
Characteristics of the Respondents 7

SURVEY SAMPLES 8

DATA COLLECTION 9

PRESENTATIONS OF THE RESULTS OF THE SURVEYS 9

USES OF THE DATA 9

MARGINS OF ERROR IN THE DATA 10

PART I. THE NATIONAL SURVEY 13

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NATIONAL SAMPLE 13

LIBRARY USE AMONG THE NATIONAL SAMPLE 17

EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY NATIONAL SAMPLE 17

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY DIFFERENT SEGMENTS OF THE NATIONAL SAMPLE . . 19
Region of the country 20
Size of community 21
Gender 21
Age 21
Race/Ethnicity 21

Highest grade level completed 22
Whether, if the respondent had completed the 12th grade or less, the respondent had a high school diploma or equivalent 22
Whether, if the respondent had an associate degree, the respondent graduated from an academic program or an occupational program 22
Marital status 22
Whether a married respondent was currently living with a spouse 23
The number of people living in the home 23
The number of preschool children living in the home 23
The number of students living in the home 23
Whether the respondent was currently a student 24
Nature of the program of study 24
Primary language spoken in the household. 24
Employment status 24
Total annual household income 25
Whether anyone in the household was disabled 25
Whether the respondent was disabled 25
The nature of the disability 25
Whether the respondent voted in the last (1988) presidential election 25
The respondent's opinion about his/her current financial condition 25
The respondents's opinion about his/her financial condition next year 25

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE NATIONAL SAMPLE 26
Whether the respondent had gone to a public library in the past year 26
Whether someone else went to a public library for the respondent 26
Whether the respondent called a public library in the last year 26
Whether the respondent had made any use of a public library in the past year 27

THE NATIONAL SAMPLE'S OPINION ABOUT AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES 27

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION AMONG SEGMENTS OF THE NATIONAL SAMPLE ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES 27
Region of country 27
Race/Ethnicity 27
Highest grade level completed 27
The number of preschoolers living in the home 27
Whether the respondent was a student 28
Whether the respondent voted in last (1988) presidential election 28
The respondent's opinion about his/her financial condition next year 28

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE NATIONAL SAMPLE 28

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE ROLES AND THE OPINIONS ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN THE NATIONAL SAMPLE 29

PART II. THE SURVEY OF AFRICAN AMERICANS 63

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE 63

LIBRARY USE AMONG THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE 67

EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE 67

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY DIFFERENT SEGMENTS OF THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE 68
Region of the country 69
% of community which is African American 69
Gender 70
Age 70
Highest grade level completed. 70
Whether, if the respondent had completed the 12th grade or less, the respondent had a high school diploma or equivalent 71
Whether, if the respondent had an associate degree, the respondent graduated from an academic program or an occupational program 71
Marital status 71
Whether a married respondent was currently living with a spouse 71
The number of people living in the home 71
The number of preschool children living in the home 71
The number of students living in the home 72
Whether the respondent was currently a student 72
Nature of the program of study 72
Employment status 72
Total annual household income 72
Whether anyone in the household was disabled 73
Whether the respondent was disabled 73
The nature of the disability 73
Whether the respondent voted in the last (1988) presidential election 73
The respondent's opinion about his/her current financial condition 73
The respondents's opinion about his/her financial condition next year 73

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE 73

THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE'S OPINION ABOUT AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES 74

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION AMONG SEGMENTS OF THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES 74

- *Region of country* 75
- *% of community which is African American* 75
- *Gender* 75
- *Marital status* 75
- *Number of people living in the home* 75
- *Whether the respondent voted in the last (1988) presidential election* 75
- *The respondent's opinion about his/her financial condition next year* 75

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE 75

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE ROLES AND THE OPINIONS ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE . . 76

PART III. THE SURVEY OF CAUCASIAN AMERICANS 107

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE 107

LIBRARY USE AMONG THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE 110

EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE 110

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY DIFFERENT SEGMENTS OF THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE 111

- *Region of the country* 113
- *Size of community* 113
- *Gender* 113
- *Age of the respondent* 113
- *Highest grade level completed.* 113
- *Whether, if the respondent had completed the 12th grade or less, the respondent had a high school diploma or equivalent* 114

Whether, if the respondent had an associate degree, the respondent graduated from an academic program or an occupational program 114
Marital status 114
Whether a married respondent was currently living with a spouse 114
The number of people living in the home 114
The number of preschool children living in the home 115
The number of students living in the home 115
Whether the respondent was currently a student 115
Nature of the program of study 115
Employment status 115
Total annual household income 116
Whether anyone in the household was disabled 116
Whether the respondent was disabled 116
The nature of the disability 117
Whether the respondent voted in the last (1988) presidential election 117
The respondent's opinion about his/her current financial condition 117
The respondents's opinion about his/her financial condition next year 117

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE 117
Whether the respondent had gone to a public library in the past year 118
Whether someone else went to a public library for the respondent 118
Whether the respondent called a public library in the last year 118
Whether the respondent had made any use of a public library in the past year 118

THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE'S OPINION ABOUT AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES 118

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION AMONG SEGMENTS OF THE CAUCASIAN SAMPLE ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES 119
Region of country 119
Size of community 119
Whether, if the respondent had completed 12th grade or less, the respondent had a high school diploma 119
Whether the respondent was a student 119

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE 120

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE ROLES AND THE OPINIONS ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE 120

PART IV. THE SURVEY OF HISPANIC AMERICANS 151

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE 151

LIBRARY USE AMONG THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE 154

EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE 154

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY DIFFERENT SEGMENTS OF THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE 155
- *Region of the country* 157
- *% of community which is Hispanic American* 157
- *Gender* 157
- *Age* 157
- *National ancestry* 158
- *Highest grade level completed* 158
- *Whether, if the respondent had completed the 12th grade or less, the respondent had a high school diploma or equivalent* 158
- *Whether, if the respondent had an associate degree, the respondent graduated from an academic program or an occupational program* 159
- *Marital status* 159
- *Whether a married respondent was currently living with a spouse* 159
- *The number of people living in the home* 159
- *The number of preschool children living in the home* 160
- *The number of students living in the home* 160
- *Whether the respondent was currently a student* 160
- *Nature of the program of study* 160
- *The language spoken at home* 160
- *Employment status* 161
- *Total annual household income* 161
- *Whether anyone in the household was disabled* 162
- *Whether the respondent was disabled* 162
- *The nature of the disability* 162
- *Whether the respondent voted in the last (1988) presidential election* 162
- *The respondent's opinion about his/her current financial condition* 162
- *The respondents's opinion about his/her financial condition next year* 162

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE 163
Whether the respondent had gone to a public library in the past year 163
Whether someone else went to a public library for the respondent 163
Whether the respondent called a public library in the last year 163
Whether the respondent had made any use of a public library in the past year 163

THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE'S OPINION ABOUT AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES 164

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION AMONG SEGMENTS OF THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES 164
Region of country 164
% of community which is Hispanic American 164
Gender 164
Age 165
National ancestry 165
Highest grade level completed 165
Whether, if the respondent had completed the 12th grade or less, the respondent had a high school diploma. 165
Marital status 165
The number of people living in the home 165
The number of preschool children living in the home 166
Principal language spoken at home 166
Total annual household income 166
Whether the respondent voted in last (1988) presidential election 166
The respondent's opinion about his/her current financial condition 166
The respondent's opinion about his/her financial condition next year 166

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE 167

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE ROLES AND THE OPINIONS ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE . . 167

PART V. THE OPINION LEADERS SURVEY 199

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE 199

LIBRARY USE AMONG THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE 201

EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE . . . 201

DIFFERENCES IN THE ROLE EVALUATIONS BY THE FOUR OPINION LEADER GROUPS . . . 202

DIFFERENCES IN THE ROLE EVALUATIONS OF OPINION LEADERS FROM DIFFERENT REGIONS OF THE COUNTRY . . . 203

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE . . . 203

THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE'S OPINION ABOUT AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES . . . 204

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION AMONG THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES . . . 205

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE . . . 205

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE ROLES AND THE OPINIONS ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE . . . 205

COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE ROLE EVALUATIONS OF THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE AND THE NATIONAL SAMPLE . . . 206

COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE ROLE EVALUATIONS OF THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE AND THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE . . . 206

COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE ROLE EVALUATIONS OF THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE AND THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE . . 207

COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE ROLE EVALUATIONS OF THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE AND THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE . . . 207

COMPARISONS OF OPINION ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES BETWEEN THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE AND THE NATIONAL SAMPLE, THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE, THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE, AND THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE . . . 207

THE QUESTIONNAIRE . . . 225

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

The purpose of this project was to describe for librarians what the public considers to be the important roles of the public library in society. It was anticipated that this information, provided both for the general population and for various groups within the population, would assist public librarians throughout the nation in understanding the service requirements of the various service populations in their communities and in selecting roles to emphasize appropriate to the needs of their communities.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The objectives of the project were twofold: 1) to design and execute a national telephone survey of households in the United States in order to assess the public's opinions concerning the importance of various roles of the public library in their communities and the public's opinions about appropriate amounts of public financing for library services; and 2) to design and execute a national telephone survey of community opinion leaders in order to assess their opinions concerning the importance of various roles of the public library in their communities and their opinions about appropriate amounts of public financing for library services.

THE ROLES OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY

Planning and Role Setting for Public Libraries[1] describes eight roles that a library could play in its community. These roles include the library performing as a community activities center, a community information center, a formal education support center, an independent learning center, a popular materials library, a preschoolers' door to learning, a reference library and a research center. The roles represent library service emphases that describe both what the library is trying to do and who the library is trying to serve. As such, the roles provide a very useful context for planning purposes. By selecting which roles to emphasize a library is better able to focus its mission in the community, to communicate this mission to the community, to determine what resources are needed to perform the selected roles, and to allocate resources to reflect the relative emphases of the selected roles. The role setting process is a particularly useful addition to the planning process for libraries and is being adopted by public libraries across the country.[2]

---

[1] McClure, Charles R.; Owen, Amy; Zweizig, Douglas L.; Lynch, Mary Jo; and Van House, Nancy A. *Planning and Role Setting for Public Libraries.* Chicago: American Library Association, 1987.

[2] Pungitore, Verna L.; Wilkerson, Jay Ed; and Yoon, Lanju. *A Study of the Development and Diffusion of the Public Library Association's Planning and Evaluation Manuals: Final Report.* Bloomington: School of Library and Information Science, Indiana University, 1990.

Recent planning projects at the Saint Paul Public Library, the Free Library of Philadelphia, the Minneapolis Public Library and Information Center, and the Atlanta-Fulton Public Library have successfully pioneered the use of the role statements in user surveys to identify the reasons why users are visiting the library and to assess the importance of each role to the users.[3] The information obtained from these surveys enabled each library to identify which roles were most and least important to its users and for which roles the highest and lowest proportions of its users visited the library. In addition, each library was able to break down the users' assessments of the roles according to the type of library the users were visiting (e.g., central or regional or community branch) and the demographic characteristics of the users (e.g., race, age, employment status, etc.). These data enabled each library to develop profiles of how various segments of its user population evaluate, or make use of, the roles of the library and to fine tune its plan down to a level of specificity appropriate for its needs.

While the planning processes discussed above were informed by the evaluations of the roles by library users, in each case the community's (i.e., the general public which would include both users and non-users) evaluations of the importance of the roles were unknown. Knowing what the community and its various constituent segments consider to be important roles for the library is essential for the planning of library services. Knowing what the community is willing to support financially is crucial to the success of the resource acquisition and allocation processes. The purpose of these national surveys is to provide such information for the nation at large, for various segments of the population, and for community opinion leaders.

PERSONNEL FOR THE PROJECT

The Principal Investigator for the study was George D'Elia, Associate Professor in the Department of Information and Decision Sciences in the Carlson School of Management at the University of Minnesota. Eleanor Jo Rodger, currently the President of the Urban Libraries Council and at the initiation of the project the Executive Director of the Public Library Association, served as a consultant to the project.

The University of Minnesota Center for Survey Research managed the pilot surveys in which various forms of the questionnaire were pre-tested, and, after the execution of the surveys, created the data bases and executed the analyses of the data under the direction of the Principal Investigator. The Gallup Organization was sub-contracted to executed the surveys.

The project was assisted throughout by an advisory committee composed of the following individuals: Kathleen Balcom, Director of the Arlington Heights [IL] Public Library; Susan

---

[3] See, D'Elia, George; Rodger, Eleanor Jo; and Bryson, John. *Saint Paul Public Library Strategic Planning Project. Phase I: Survey and Evaluation*, 1988, 448 p. D'Elia, George (with E.J. Rodger). *Free Library of Philadelphia Patron Survey: Final Report*, 1990, 126 p. D'Elia, George. *The Minneapolis Public Library and Information Center Patron Survey: Final Report*, 1991, 186 p. D'Elia, George. *The Atlanta-Fulton Public Library User Survey: Final Report*, 1993, 252 p. See also D'Elia, George; Rodger, Eleanor Jo; and Williams, Carole. "Involving Patrons in the Role Setting Process." *Public Libraries* (November/December 1991): 338 - 345.

Goldberg, Director of the Minneapolis Public Library and Information Center; Martin Gomez, Director of the Oakland [CA] Public Library; Sheldon Kaye, Director of the Portland [ME] Public Library; Samuel Morrison, Director of the Broward County [FL] Public Library; Amy Owen, Director of the Utah State Library Division; and Carole Williams, Public Services Manager, Saint Paul [MN] Public Library.

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

The development of the questionnaire[4] that was used in the surveys was affected by the following considerations:

1) the various roles of the library needed to be described in language that the average person could understand;

2) the introduction to the role evaluation question and the scale to measure the respondent's opinion of the importance of each role had to be constructed so as to minimize the occurrence of importance bias[5] - the tendency for a respondent to infer that the object or issue of interest must have value since someone (in this case, the Gallup Organization) is conducting a survey about it;

3) the question asking for an opinion about the amount of money that a community should spend on library services had to grounded in reality; and

4) the interview needed to be short, no longer than 10 minutes on average.

The Roles Questions

Planning and Role Setting for Public Libraries describes the roles of the library as those of a community activities center, a community information center, a formal education support center, an independent learning center, a popular materials library, a preschoolers' door to learning, a reference library, and a research center. The experiences with the role-based surveys of users of urban library systems previously noted have demonstrated that it is useful also 1) to specify two reference roles - reference services to businesses in the community and reference services to individuals in the community, and 2) to recognize that for many people the library serves as a destination for social interaction or a workplace away from home. Consequently, for these national surveys, the eight roles described in *Planning and Role Setting for Public Libraries* were augmented to include descriptions of the library serving as a reference library for businesses and as a workplace away from home.

---

[4] A copy of the questionnaire appears at the end of this report.

[5] See, Mitchell, Robert Cameron and Carson, Richard T. *Using Surveys to Value Public Goods*. Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future, 1989.

In developing descriptions of the roles it was decided that

1) the descriptions of the roles in *Planning and Role Setting for Public Libraries*, while understandable to an audience of professional librarians, were too vague for use in a telephone survey of the public;

2) the roles should not be described as roles or missions, but rather the roles should be described as different kinds of services that libraries provide;

3) the descriptions of the roles needed to include concrete examples of the kinds of services or materials appropriate to the role so as to provide some meaningful frame of reference to people both familiar and unfamiliar with library services;[6] and

4) each role should be evaluated by the respondent in terms of its importance to the community.

Three different pilot surveys were executed in February, March, and April of 1992 by the University of Minnesota Center for Survey Research in which different versions of role descriptions were evaluated for length, the time required to read, and understandability based on respondents' hesitations in answering the questions, requests for additional information or explanation, and refusals to answer. The final descriptions of the roles that were read to the respondents in the surveys were as follows (note that the corresponding names of the roles, which appear in parentheses, were not read to the respondents):

> "the library provides students, both children and adults, with the books, magazines and other services they need to do their school work" (*Formal Education Support Center*);
>
> "the library provides preschool children with picture books, story hours, and educational programs so that these children can have fun and learn to appreciate reading" (*Preschoolers' Door to Learning*);
>
> "the library provides people with the information they need to answer personal and household questions. This could include, for example, information about how to fix things around the house, hobbies, health issues, or the quality and prices of home appliances"(*Reference Library for personal information*);
>
> "the library provides businesses in your community with the information they need to survive and prosper. This could include, for example, information about sales or

---

[6] While it was recognized that a respondent's evaluation of a role might be influenced by the particular set of examples included in the description of the role, all parties involved (i.e., the Project Advisory Committee, the University of Minnesota Center for Survey Research, and the Gallup Organization) agreed that concrete examples were essential to the description of the roles.

> marketing, worker safety, environmental protection, or setting up a new business" (*Reference Library for community businesses*);
>
> "the library serves as a neighborhood or community activity center - a place where organizations or clubs could hold meetings or present concerts and lectures" (*Community Activities Center*);
>
> "the library provides scientists and scholars with the specialized research collections of books, magazines and computerized information they need in order to do research or write books" (*Research Center*);
>
> "the library provides people with information about their community. This could include, for example, information about local government, issues or laws, or about local community services such as health clinics or daycare" (*Community Information Center*);
>
> "the library provides adults who are not students with the materials and services they need in order to better themselves or to learn a new skill such as how to read and write" (*Independent Learning Center*);
>
> "the library provides people with a comfortable place to go when they need someplace outside of their house or apartment to read or think or work" (*Public Work Place*); and
>
> "the library provides people with a collection of current best selling books and popular magazines, videos and musical recordings for borrowing" (*Popular Materials Library*).

The respondents were asked to evaluate each of these roles in terms of how important they thought the role was to their community. Given the constraints of a telephone interview, the number of response categories was limited to four. The response categories were designed to cover the full range of the continuum of the concept of "importance" from no importance to a great deal of importance. Three different versions of response categories were tested during the pilot surveys. The response categories were evaluated in terms of how well the respondents were able to use the categories (i.e. how well they were able to internalize and remember the categories in responding to the role questions) and in terms of the range of opinions elicited from the respondents. The final set of response categories used in the surveys were "not important," "slightly important," moderately important," and "very important."

As a guard against the importance bias mentioned above, the introduction to the respondent for the assessment of the importance of the roles tried to convey to the respondent the message that it was acceptable to consider a role to be unimportant. The role assessment question with the description of the first role was as follows:

> "I'm going to describe to you some of the kinds of services that public libraries provide for their communities. Some people think these services are important while others do not. After each description, I'd like you to tell me ***how important you think that kind of service is to your community***. [READ LIST.]

... the library provides *students, both children and adults,*with the books, magazines and other services they need to do their school work.

How important would you say that this service is to your COMMUNITY?"

Not important	1
Slightly important	2
Moderately important	3
Very important	4
DK	5
(Refused)	9.

The Financial Support Question

In developing the question soliciting the respondent's opinion about the amount of financial support that the community should provide to the library, it was decided that the respondent should be given sufficient information to provide a realistic basis for assessment. Accordingly, the respondent was provided a current range of actual community per capita support (from a low $4.00 a year to a high of $100 a year) which served as an implicit scale with anchors.[7] In the pilot surveys two different versions of the question were tested. In Version A, the respondent was told the range and then asked an open-ended question about how much support he thought his community should provide its public library. In Version B, the respondent was told the range and was then provided with a scale of $20 intervals (e.g., $1 to $20, $21 - $40, etc.) from which he was asked to select an interval. An analysis of the results indicated that the two versions produced results that were not statistically different (the mean for Version A was $37.25 while the Mean for Version B was $40.00). However, the percentage of respondents who refused to answer the open-ended Version A was much higher (47%) than the scaled Version B (27%). Consequently, the decision was made to use the scaled version of the question.

Many of the non-respondents indicated that they would be in a better position to offer an opinion if they knew how much their communities were currently spending. While we could not provide this community specific information to the respondent, we could provide the national average per capita support. Consequently, we tested a third version of the question (Version C) in which, in addition to the range and scale provided in Version B, the respondent was told that the national average per capita support for public libraries was $16.[8] The results of this test indicated that the non-response rate was reduced to 15%. The mean score for Version C was $34.70 which was lower than the mean score that had been obtained with Version B. It appeared that the knowledge of the national per capita average both reduced the number of nonrespondents and tempered the respondents' opinions about financial support. Given that Version C both produced the highest response rate and provided the most information so that the respondents could render informed opinions, Version C was the version of the question used in the surveys. The full text of the question follows:

---

[7] These figures were obtained from *Public Library Data Service Statistical Report '91*. Chicago: Public Library Association/ American Library Association, Chicago, 1991.

[8] This figure was obtained from *Public Libraries: 1990, Adrienne Chute, Electronic E.D. TABS, March 1992, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Statistics, NCES 92-028.*

"Some communities in this country spend as little as $4 per person a year to provide a limited selection of the kinds of services that we just described while other communities spend as much as $100 per person a year to provide a much wider selection of these services. On average, communities in this country spend about $16 per person a year on their public libraries. How much money do you think your community should spend annually on its public library? Would you say (READ LIST)..."

$0 per person	0
$1 - $20 / person	1
$21 - $40 / person........	2
$41 - $60 / person........	3
$61 - $80 / person........	4
$81 - $100 / person......	5
More than $100 / person	6
No opinion / DK..........	7
DK.................................	8
RA.................................	9.

Characteristics of the Respondents

The following characteristics of the respondents, designed in part to match the demographics obtained and reported by the 1990 Census, were obtained in the survey: the region of the country where the respondent lived; the size of the community in which the respondent lived; the age of the respondent; whether the respondent was of Hispanic ancestry and, if so, his or her national origin; the respondent's race; the highest grade level of education completed by the respondent and, if the 12th grade or less, whether the respondent had a high school diploma or equivalent; whether, if the respondent had an associate degree, the respondent graduated from an academic program or an occupational program; the respondent's current marital status and, if married, whether the respondent was currently living with a spouse; the number of people living in the respondent's home; the number of preschool children living in the home; the number of students living in the home; whether the respondent was currently a student and, if so, the nature of the program of study; the primary language spoken at home; the respondent's current employment status; total annual household income; whether anyone in the household was disabled; whether the respondent was disabled and, if so, the nature of the disability; the respondent's gender; whether the respondent voted in the last (at the time of the survey the 1988) presidential election; whether the respondent personally went to a public library in the past year and, if so, how many times; whether anyone else went to the library for the respondent; whether the respondent called the library for information in the past year; the respondent's opinion about his or her current financial situation; and the respondent's opinion about his or her financial situation next year.

SURVEY SAMPLES

The survey population was limited to adults aged 18 years or older who could be reached by telephone. The samples for the surveys included the following:

1) a national probability sample (N = 1,001) representing a cross-section of the national population;[9]

2) a national probability sample (N = 846) of Caucasian Americans who were the same respondents as those Caucasian Americans who were obtained in the national probability sample;

3) a national probability sample of African Americans (N = 401) which included 79 African Americans who were obtained in the national probability sample plus an additional 322 African Americans who were obtained from a supplemental national probability sample of African Americans;

4) a national probability sample of Hispanic Americans (N = 399) which included 41 Hispanic Americans who were obtained in the national probability sample plus an additional 358 Hispanic Americans who were obtained from a supplemental national probability sample of Hispanic Americans; and

5) a sample of community opinion leaders (N = 300) who were defined as individuals who, because of the positions they hold in the community, have an influence on the shaping of public opinion. For this survey, opinion leaders were defined as *media leaders* (e.g., newspaper editors and editorial writers, TV and radio news directors), *political leaders* (e.g., elected or appointed public officials), *business and civic leaders* (e.g., executives and administrators from for-profit and non-profit organizations and associations), and *educational leaders* (e.g., administrators and officers from primary and secondary schools and institutions of higher learning).

---

[9] Since the number of African Americans and Hispanic Americans that would be surveyed by means of a national probability sample would be too few for cross group comparisons and too few for generalizations to the African American and Hispanic American populations, the U.S. Department of Education provided funding to obtain supplemental samples of African Americans and Hispanic Americans. Cost estimates from The Gallup Organization for supplemental samples of Asian Americans and Native Americans were, unfortunately, prohibitively expensive and consequently supplemental samples for these racial groups could not be obtained.

DATA COLLECTION

All surveys were conducted by the Gallup Organization. The national survey and the survey of opinion leaders were conducted in May and June of 1992. The surveys of African Americans and Hispanic Americans were conducted in July and August of 1992. Descriptions of the survey procedures used by the Gallup Organization are provided in the Appendix which is a separately bound, companion publication.

PRESENTATIONS OF THE RESULTS OF THE SURVEYS

The remainder of the report is divided into five parts.

PART I reports the results of the national survey. First, the public's evaluations of the importance of the roles are reported and then these data are broken down and reported for the various demographic segments of the sample. Second, the public's opinion about levels of public financing for library services is reported and then these data are broken down and reported for the various demographic segments of the sample. Third, the relationships between role evaluations and levels of financial support are reported.

PART II reports the results of the survey of African Americans. The presentation of the results follows the same pattern as that described above for the national survey.

PART III reports the results of the survey of Caucasian Americans. The presentation of the results follows the same pattern as that described above for the national survey.

PART IV reports the results of the survey of Hispanic Americans. The presentation of the results follows the same pattern as that described above for the national survey.

PART V reports the results of the opinion leaders survey. First reported are the opinion leaders' evaluations of the importance of the roles, the opinion leaders' opinion about levels of public financing for library services, and the relationships between role evaluations and levels of financial support. Then, the opinion leaders' evaluations of the roles and the their opinion about levels of public financing for library services are compared to those of the national sample and the African American, Caucasian American, and Hispanic American samples.

USES OF THE DATA

These data can used by a library[10] (or by individual branches within a system) to generate a tentative set of service roles for its community. For example, a library could begin by identifying the significant service populations of its community based on race, gender, age, education level, size of household, or any of the other demographic characteristics reported in these surveys. For each of these significant service populations (for example, African American households with preschoolers), the library could identify the roles that are reported in these surveys to be most important to the respondents who represent the service population (for example, the roles that received the highest ratings of importance by African American respondents living in households with preschool children). The library could draw the reasonable inference that the service populations in its community would most likely share the same opinions about the importance of the roles as the respondents in the surveys who represented those service populations. A library could then develop a tentative set of roles for its community that could be tested by a small community survey, or by interviews with representatives of its various service populations, or by town meetings, or by any other method appropriate to local conditions or resources.

---

[10] "Library" is a term used here to refer to the collective leadership of the library and any other parties that might be involved in the planning activities of the library.

MARGINS OF ERROR IN THE DATA

All surveys of samples are subject to sampling error. Sampling error is defined as the difference between the results obtained from the sample and the results that would have been obtained from the population had that population been surveyed. In drawing the inference that the results reported from this survey for a particular sample are representative of service population that the sample represents, the reader should be aware of the size of the sampling error involved in such an inference and the degree of confidence that accompanies the inference.

The results of the evaluations of the importance of the roles are reported both as mean scores for the four-point importance scales and as the percentage of the sample which rated the role "very important." Since the percentage data will likely be more easily interpreted and used, a chart is provided on page 12 which provides approximate estimates of the size of the sampling error associated with the percentage of a sample which rated a role as "very important." These estimates of sampling error have been calculated at the 95% level of confidence, which means that we are 95% confident that the sampling error (for a particular percentage for a particular size sample) is not larger than the figure shown.[11] The format of the chart is as follows: the percentages in the column headings (50%, 60%, etc.) represent the percentage of a sample that rated a role as being "very important;" the row labels represent samples of different sizes; and the figures listed in the chart at the intersects of the columns and rows represent the sampling errors expressed as ± percentage points.

The following example demonstrates how to use the chart of sampling errors. It is reported for the national survey (see Table 1) that 51.4% of the respondents rated the Popular Materials Library role as "very important." Referring to the chart of Estimated Sampling Errors, read down the column for percentages near 50% until the row for samples of size 1000. At this point the listed sampling error is ± 3.1%. Therefore, we can say, with about a 95% level of confidence, that the true percentage of the population who would rate the Popular Materials Library role as "very important" *lies somewhere in the approximate interval of 51.4% ± 3.1%*, or somewhere in the interval bounded by 48.3% and 54.5%.

---

[11] For a detailed discussion of the construction and interpretation of confidence intervals see McClave, James T. and Benson, George P. *Statistics for Business and Economics*. San Francisco: Dellen Publishing Company, 1991. For a good library oriented discussion see Kantor, Paul. *Objective Performance Measures for Academic and Research Libraries*. Washington D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1984.

The chart can also be used to construct confidence intervals for the data that have been reported for the various demographic groups of respondents. For example, it is reported for the national survey (see Table 4) that males and females differed in their ratings of the importance of the Popular Materials Library role - 43.0% of the males and 60.1% of the females rated the role "very important." Consequently, a library might want to use separate estimates with confidence intervals for males and females. To construct the confidence interval for males, refer to the chart of Estimated Sampling Errors and read down the column for percentages near 40% until the row for samples of size 500. At this point the listed sampling error is ± 4.3%. Therefore, we can say, with about a 95% level of confidence, that the true percentage of the male population who would rate the Popular Materials Library role as "very important" lies somewhere in the approximate interval of 43.0% ± 4.3%, or somewhere in the interval bounded by 38.7% and 47.3%. To construct the confidence interval for females, refer to the chart of Estimated Sampling Errors and read down the column for percentages near 60% until the row for samples of size 500. At this point the listed sampling error is ± 4.3%. Therefore, we can say, with about a 95% level of confidence, that the true percentage of the female population who would rate the Popular Materials Library role as "very important" lies somewhere in the approximate interval of 60.1% ± 4.3%, or somewhere in the interval bounded by 55.8% and 64.4%.

The reader should note that the construction of confidence intervals for demographic groups is appropriate when the responses of those groups are reported to be statistically different. If the responses of the groups are nor statistically different, then the confidence interval for the entire sample can be used. For example, the comparisons of the male and female responses (Table 4) indicated that the two groups did not differ in their ratings of the importance of the Reference Library for personal information role. Consequently, since the two groups agree on this role, it would not be necessary to construct separate confidence intervals for each group. The confidence interval that could be constructed for this role from the % reported for the entire sample (Table 1) would be sufficient.

The calculation of the confidence interval for quantitative data, such as the mean suggested per capita spending for library services which is reported for this survey, is somewhat more complicated and cannot be estimated by means of a chart. The confidence intervals for the mean suggested per capita spending reported for the various samples have been calculated and are presented in the appropriate tables. The interpretation of these intervals is the same as the interpretation of the intervals for the percentage data discussed above.

ESTIMATED SAMPLING ERRORS
(ESTIMATED 95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS FOR % OF SAMPLE RATING A ROLE AS "VERY IMPORTANT")

	Percentages of Sample Rating a Role as "Very Important"				
	50%	60% (40%)	70% (30%)	80% (20%)	90% (10%)
Sample Sizes					
100	10.0	9.6	9.0	7.8	5.9
200	6.9	6.8	6.4	5.5	4.2
300	5.7	5.5	5.2	4.5	3.4
400	4.9	4.8	4.5	3.9	2.9
500	4.4	4.3	4.0	3.5	2.6
600	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.2	2.4
700	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.0	2.2
800	3.5	3.4	3.2	2.8	2.1
900	3.3	3.2	3.0	2.6	2.0
1000	3.1	3.0	2.8	2.5	1.9

Note: The column labeled 50% is for use with % ratings that are near 50%, the column labeled 60% (40%) is for use with % ratings that are near 60% or near 40%, the column labeled 70% (30%) is for use with % ratings that are near 70% or near 30%, the column labeled 80% (20%) is for use with % ratings that are near 80% or near 20%, and the column labeled 90% (10%) is for use with % ratings that are near 90% or near 10%.

PART I. THE NATIONAL SURVEY

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NATIONAL SAMPLE

The national probability sample included 1,001 respondents. The data from this sample were weighted to ensure that the demographic characteristics of the weighted sample conformed to the latest available Census Bureau estimates of the characteristics of the national population for age, gender, race, formal education attainment, and region of country. The demographic characteristics of the sample are as follows[1]:

Region of country[2]	21.1%	northeast states
	33.9%	south central states
	24.9%	north central states
	20.2%	western states
Size of community[3]	6.7%	over 1,000,000
	11.6%	250,000 - 1,000,000
	81.7%	under 250,000
Gender	47.3%	male
	52.7%	female
Age	38.5%	18 - 35 years
	26.0%	36 - 50 years
	17.3%	51 - 65 years
	17.3%	66 years and older
	1.0%	missing
Hispanic ancestry	4.1%	Hispanic
	95.5%	Non-Hispanic
	.4%	missing

---

[1] The frequency distributions for the responses to all the questions in the interview are presented in the Appendix for this report. The Appendix is a separately bound publication.

[2] These regional areas are defined by The Gallup Organization as follows: northeast states = Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont; south central states = Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Washington D.C., Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia; north central states = Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin; western states = Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

[3] The Gallup Organization defined size of community as follows: incorporated cities with populations over 1,000,000; incorporated cities with populations of 250,000 to 1,000,000; and incorporated cities or unincorporated communities with populations under 250,000.

Race[4]	86.2%	Caucasian
	7.9%	African American
	2.0%	Hispanic/Mexican
	1.1%	Native American
	1.3%	Asian Pacific Islanders
	.9%	Other
	1.0%	missing
Grade level completed	7.4%	8th grade or less
	10.6%	9th - 11th grade
	38.3%	12th grade
	17.4%	some college
	3.8%	associate degree
	14.4%	bachelor's degree
	4.5%	master's degree
	3.4%	professional/doctoral
	.4%	missing
High school diploma or equivalent[5]	39.9%	yes
	16.3%	no
	43.8%	missing
Marital status	58.9%	married
	9.9%	widowed
	10.4%	divorced
	20.3%	never married
	.5%	missing
Living with spouse	56.8%	yes
	2.1%	no
	41.2%	missing

---

[4] The categories of race provided to the respondents were the same categories used in the 1990 Census; namely, White, Black, American Indian, Eskimo or Aleut, and Asian or Pacific Islander. Following the practice of the 1990 Census, Hispanic ancestry was treated as a question separate from the racial question. The response category for Hispanic/Mexican, which appears here, was not an option provided to the respondent. However, 2% of the respondents insisted that their race was Hispanic or Mexican and their response was recorded as such.

[5] This question was asked only of those respondents who answered that they had a completed 12 grades of school or less.

# of people living at home	17.3%	one
	33.3%	two
	18.0%	three
	18.2%	four
	8.2%	five
	3.9%	six or more
	1.2%	missing
# of preschool children at home	63.2%	zero
	10.6%	one
	6.0%	two
	.6%	three
	.6%	four
	18.9%	missing
# of school children at home	44.4%	zero
	19.3%	one
	12.7%	two
	3.3%	three
	1.6%	four or more
	18.7%	missing
Respondents who were students	0.9%	high school
	1.1%	non-academic program
	5.2%	college students
	2.0%	graduate students
	90.8%	missing
Primary language spoken at home	97.3%	English
	1.0%	Spanish
	1.7%	missing
Employment status	51.8%	employed full-time
	12.6%	employed part-time
	6.6%	unemployed
	20.0%	retired
	8.3%	not in work force
	.7%	missing

Household income	1.8%	less than $5,000
	4.7%	$ 5,000 - $ 9,999
	7.5%	$10,000 - $14,999
	7.6%	$15,000 - $19,999
	8.2%	$20,000 - $24,999
	11.2%	$25,000 - $29,999
	7.9%	$30,000 - $34,999
(Median interval)	9.2%	$35,000 - $39,999
	5.2%	$40,000 - $44,999
	4.6%	$45,000 - $49,999
	3.7%	$50,000 - $54,999
	2.0%	$55,000 - $59,999
	2.4%	$60,000 - $64,999
	1.1%	$65,000 - $69,999
	1.2%	$70,000 - $74,999
	6.9%	$75,000 or more
	14.7%	missing
Disabled person in household	14.4%	yes
	83.5%	no
	2.1%	missing
Respondent disabled	7.8%	yes
	5.5%	no
	86.7%	missing
Nature of disability	1.0%	sight
	4.9%	mobility
	94.1%	missing
Voted in '88 election	62.8%	yes
	36.5%	no
	.7%	missing
Current financial situation	25.1%	better off than last year
	23.3%	worse off than last year
	50.6%	about the same
	1.0%	missing
Future financial situation	45.6%	better off next year
	7.7%	worse off next year
	42.6%	about the same
	4.1%	missing.

LIBRARY USE AMONG THE NATIONAL SAMPLE

The data indicated that in the past year 57.1% of the respondents had personally gone to a public library, 21.4% of the respondents reported that someone else had obtained materials for them, and 23.1% of the respondents had called a library for information. Controlling for overlap among these activities, it was determined that 63.3% of the respondents had in some way used a public library in the last year while 36.7% of the respondents reported no use of a library.

EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY THE NATIONAL SAMPLE

The responses to the role evaluation questions were analyzed in two ways: first, mean scores for the role importance scales were calculated; and second, the percentages of respondents who for each role selected the category "very important" were tabulated. While the mean importance scale score yields a more precise estimate of the respondents' evaluations of the importance of a role, the percentage of respondents who selected the category "very important" is the more easily understood and communicated estimate of the importance of a role. All of the tables reporting results of role evaluations present both the mean scale scores and the percentage "scores."

The results of the role evaluations are reported in Table 1 in ranked order from the role receiving the highest mean importance scale score to the role receiving the lowest mean importance scale score. These results can be interpreted in two ways: first, the scores for any given role can be interpreted in terms of their position or standing on the four-point importance scale (an absolute assessment); and second, the scores for any given role can be interpreted in terms of their ranking relative to the scores received by the other roles (a relative assessment). For example, more than half of the sample (51.4%) rated the Popular Materials Library role as "very important" with a mean score of 3.35, but this rating places the role in ninth position of importance compared to the mean scores received by the other roles. The reader should note that the ranking by mean score is not the same as the ranking by the percentage "score." The reader should also note that the distance between the mean scores for some of the roles is quite small indicating that, while one role is ranked higher or lower than another role, for all practical purposes the roles are about equal in importance. The same observation could also be made for the percentage "scores."

The results in Table 1 indicate that a majority of the general public considered eight out of the ten roles to be "very important." Of these, however, the Formal Education Support Center role, the Independent Learning Center role, the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role, and the Research Center role received the highest ratings of importance strongly suggesting that the public considers the public library's role of supporting the educational aspirations of the community to be its most important role.

In evaluating these results we need to keep in mind some of the anomalies in the role statements and the public's interpretations of the role statements that could have affected the results. For example, it is difficult to imagine how a library could serve the educational demands of the community without providing excellent reference service and yet the reference service roles were not evaluated that highly. The answer probably lies in the wording of the roles. For example, the Formal Education Support Center role and the Independent Learning Center role described services supporting the educational needs of the user. It is possible that the respondents subsumed the importance of reference service for educational support under these roles. The Reference Library role for personal information described a service to meet the personal information needs of people and was not in any way associated with educational needs. In addition, there is evidence to indicate that the public interprets the Research Center role, which is intended to describe libraries that serve the specialized needs of scholars and researchers conducting original research, as an educational support role.[6] This difference of interpretation is reflected in the higher scores obtained for the Research Center role than for the two Reference Library roles in Table 1.

In interpreting these results, it should also be noted that, in comparison to the results of the previously mentioned roles-based user surveys, there appears be a difference between why people value the library and why people use the library. The most obvious difference is with the Popular Materials Library role. For example, the data from this survey indicate that the respondents considered the Popular Materials Library role to be relatively low in importance compared to the other roles, while the data from surveys of users of the Free Library of Philadelphia, the Minneapolis Public Library and Information Center, and the Atlanta-Fulton Public Library revealed that in each system more users selected the Popular Materials Library role as a reason for coming to the library than any other single role-based reason for coming to the library. However, it should also be noted that among the role descriptions there are clusters of roles that describe both a set of educational support roles of the library and a set of information provision roles of the library. When the responses of the users to the role descriptions were aggregated into these clusters representing the educational support roles of the library and the information provision roles of the library, the numbers of users who selected either the cluster of educational support roles or the cluster of information provision roles tended to equal or surpass the number of users who selected the popular materials role.[7] Consequently, the data from this survey and from the aforementioned user surveys tend to be in agreement. While people tend to value the library for its role as a popular materials library,[8] they tend not to value the library for this role as much as for its roles as an educational support center and as an information provider. Likewise, while many users tend to use the library for popular materials, many more tend to use it for educational support and for access to information.[9] Library managers need to be sensitive to these differences as they interpret the results of this survey and as they position the library for resource acquisition. They should also be sensitive to these differences when allocating acquired resources.

---

[6] In a user survey conducted for the Free Library of Philadelphia in which users were asked to identify which role statements best described their reasons for visiting the library, users in community branch libraries, which clearly were not considered by the Free Library of Philadelphia to be research libraries, selected the Research Center role description as a reason why they were visiting the library. In addition, students, in disproportionately higher numbers than non-students, selected the Research Center role as a reason for coming to the library. These results indicate that the public, especially students, do not interpret the Research Center Role as the profession interprets the role. It appears that, in the mind of the public, research is analogous to reference.

[7] For a detailed presentation of these results see George D'Elia and Eleanor Jo Rodger, "Why Patrons Use the Library: Patron Use and Public Library Roles." Manuscript is currently under review by *Public Libraries*.

[8] Subsequent analysis of the data indicated that both users and nonusers of the library agree on this point (see Table 21).

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY DIFFERENT SEGMENTS OF THE NATIONAL SAMPLE

The respondents' opinions about the importance of each role were tested for differences between or among groups of respondents using analysis of variance.[10] The different groups of respondents were identified by, or created from, the following characteristics: the region of the country where the respondent lived; the size of the community in which the respondent lived; the gender of the respondent; the age of the respondent; the race of the respondent; the highest grade level of education completed by the respondent and, if the 12th grade or less, whether the respondent had a high school diploma or equivalent; whether the respondent was a high school graduate; whether, if the respondent had an associate degree, the respondent graduated from an academic program or an occupational program; the respondent's current marital status and, if married, whether the respondent was currently living with a spouse; the number of people living in the respondent's home; the number of preschool children living in the home; the number of students living in the home; whether the respondent was currently a student and, if so, the nature of the program of study; the primary language spoken at home; the respondent's current employment status; total annual household income; whether anyone in the household was disabled; whether the respondent was disabled and, if so, the nature of the disability; whether the respondent voted in the last (i.e., 1988) presidential election; the respondent's opinion about his or her current financial situation; the respondent's opinion about his or her financial situation next year; whether the respondent personally went to a public library in the past year and, if so, how many times; whether anyone else went to the library for the respondent; whether the respondent called the library for information in the past year; and whether the respondent made any use of the library in the past year.

---

[9] As a final *caveat*, it should also be noted that there are dramatic differences between Caucasian users of libraries and African American, Asian American, Hispanic American, and Native American users of libraries in terms of the reasons why these groups use the library. Users of color tend to use the library for educational support and access to information in substantially greater proportions than Caucasian users. There does not appear to be a difference among these groups in terms of their use of the library for popular materials. Please see the paper by D'Elia and Rodger cited above for an extended discussion of these differences among racial groups of library users.

[10] Analysis of variance is a statistical procedure for testing whether the observed differences among group means for each role evaluation occurred by chance or because the groups differed in their evaluations of the importance of the role. A statistically significant difference among the group means is defined as one whose probability of occurring by chance (the α level reported in the tables) is so low that we choose to conclude that the difference did not occur by chance but that it occurred because the groups differed in their evaluation of the role. All differences with an α level of .05 or less (that is, the probability that the difference occurred by chance is 5 out of a hundred or less) are considered to be statistically significant. The α levels for all statistically significant differences are reported in the tables. All differences with an α level greater than .05 (that is, the probability that the difference occurred by chance is greater than 5 out of a hundred) are considered to be non-significant and are designated as such in the table with the initials n.s.

A non-trivial difference is defined as a statistically significant difference whose magnitude of difference is sufficiently large that it warrants attention for possible usefulness in managerial decision making. By contrast, a trivial difference is defined as a statistically significant difference whose magnitude of difference is so small or trivial as to be of questionable value in managerial decision making. Deciding whether a statistically significant difference is trivial or non-trivial is a judgement call. We have adopted the rule that if R^2, the coefficient of determination, is equal to or greater than .02 the difference is considered to be non-trivial. The coefficient of determination measures the amount of variation in the role evaluation scores that is explained by the group differences - the larger the coefficient of determination, the more meaningful the difference. The coefficients of determination for all statistically significant differences are reported in the tables so assessments about triviality can be made.

In the preceding analyses, the quantitative characteristics of the respondents (age, highest grade level of education completed, the number of people living in the home, the number of preschool children living in the home, the number of students living in the home, and total household income) were grouped into intervals (e.g., respondents 18 to 35 years old, respondents 36 to 50 years old, etc.) and the mean role importance scale scores for these groups were compared for differences using analysis of variance. This was done in order to facilitate comparisons to local data which oftentimes are available only in this grouped format. Another way of analyzing whether any of these characteristics of the respondents is related to the respondents' evaluations of the importance of the roles is by means of correlation analysis[11] which tests for the presence of a trend between the characteristic and the role importance score. For example, as the education level of the respondents increases does their evaluation of the importance of a role tend to increase or decrease? In order to determine if trends such as this exist, each of these quantitative characteristics of the respondents was also entered into a correlation analysis with each of the role importance scales.

While the results of the analyses of variance with the grouped data and the results of the correlation analyses with the ungrouped data are complementary, it should be noted that the correlation analyses are not always sensitive to a difference between two or more groups which might exist. Consequently, the results of the two tests sometimes do not agree. The results of both sets of analyses are reported below.

Region of the country. There were no statistically significant differences in the role evaluations by respondents living in the four regions of the country (see Table 2).

---

[11] A correlation coefficient is an index of the strength of the relationship between two quantitative variables. The coefficient can take a value from -1.00 (indicating a perfect inverse relationship) to 0.00 (indicating the absence of any relationship) to +1.00 (indicating a perfect positive relationship). Typically, correlation coefficients appear either as a negative decimal value (indicating that high scores for one variable are associated with low scores for the other variable) or as a positive decimal value (indicating that high scores for one variable are associated with high scores for the other variable). The higher the decimal value, the stronger the relationship.

A statistically significant relationship is defined as one whose probability of occurrence by chance is so low that we choose to conclude that it did not occur by chance but that it occurred because the two variables are related. A non-trivial relationship is defined as a statistically significant relationship of sufficient strength that it warrants attention for possible usefulness in managerial decision making. In this report, correlation coefficients equal to or greater than ±.15 are considered to be non-trivial.

Size of community. There were no statistically significant differences in the role evaluations by respondents living in communities of different size populations (see Table 3).

Gender. There were three statistically significant and non-trivial differences and six statistically significant but trivial differences in the role evaluations by male and female respondents. Of particular note, however, was the pattern of these differences between males and females. The female respondents rated all roles (with the exception of the Reference Library for personal information role) higher than did the male respondents (see Table 4). Interestingly, there was little difference between males and females in the relative rank orders of the role scores (the correlation coefficient between the two sets of mean scores was .97). In effect, females considered each of the roles of the library to be more important than did the males, but both groups tended to agree about which roles were more important relative to other roles.

Age. There were no statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between the age of the respondents and their evaluations of the roles.

The respondents were also divided into four age groups: 18 - 35 years old; 36 - 50 years old; 51 - 65 years old; and over 65 years old. Comparisons of the mean importance scale sores for these four groups indicated that there were four statistically significant, but trivial, differences among the groups (see Table 5). Respondents who were 18 to 35 years old rated the Reference Library for business higher than respondents who were older than 65. Respondents who were 36 to 50 years old rated the Community Activities Center role lower than respondents who were older than 65 years. Respondents who were 18 to 35 years old rated the Independent Learning Center role higher than respondents who were 51 - 65 years old and respondents who were older than 65. Respondents who were 51 - 65 years old and respondents who were over 65 years old rated the Public Work Place role higher than respondents who were 18 - 35 years old and respondents who were 36 - 50 years old.

Race/Ethnicity. The national sample was subdivided into three groups; Caucasian Americans, African Americans , and Hispanic Americans. The African American segment and the Hispanic American segment were augmented by additional quota samples to bring their respective sample sizes to N = 401 and N = 399. These two groups were then compared to the remaining Caucasian[12] American segment from the national sample (N = 846). Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for these three groups indicated that there were 10 statistically significant differences, of which seven were non-trivial, between the Caucasian American respondents and the African American and Hispanic American respondents (see Table 6). For each role, the Caucasian American respondents rendered a significantly lower evaluation of its importance to the community than did either the African American or Hispanic American respondents. In evaluating the roles of the library, the Caucasian American group on average selected the response category "very important" 64% of the time, while the African American group on average selected the response category "very important" 81% of the time, and the Hispanic American group on average selected the response category "very important" 78% of the time.

---

[12] The Caucasian respondents were Caucasians who did not report having Hispanic ancestry. Hispanics who were also of African ancestry were classified by the Gallup Organization either as Hispanic Americans if they were living in an Hispanic neighborhood or as African Americans if they were living in an African American neighborhood.

The results of these comparisons indicated that among all three groups the highest percentages of "very important" responses occurred for the three educational roles of the public library (the Formal Educational Support Center, the Independent Learning Center, and the Preschoolers' Door to Learning). Further analyses indicated that there were only minor differences among the three groups in terms of each group's rank ordering of the ten roles from those roles receiving the highest percentages of "very important" to those receiving the lowest percentages of "very important." In effect, the African American and Hispanic American respondents systematically evaluated the importance of each of the roles of the public library to the community more highly than did the Caucasian respondents, but all three groups tended to agree about which roles were most important relative to the other roles. Given the systematic differences among the three groups, the results of the surveys of each of the groups are presented separately in this report.

Highest grade level completed. There was one statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficient. The highest grade level completed by the respondents was inversely correlated with the respondents' rating of the importance of the Public Work Place role. The lower the grade level completed, the higher the rating of the importance of the Public Work Place role; the higher the grade level completed, the lower the rating of the importance of the Public Work Place role.

The respondents were divided into five groups based on the number of grades completed: 8th grade or less, 9th - 11th grade, 12th grade, some college, and college graduates. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for these five groups indicated that there were five statistically significant differences among the groups (see Table 7). Respondents who had completed 9th - 11th grade rated the Formal Education Support role lower than all other groups. Respondents who had completed the 8th grade or less rated the Reference Library for personal information role higher than all other groups. Respondents who had completed the 8th grade or less rated the Research center role higher than all other groups. Respondents who had graduated from college rated the Community Information Center role lower than respondents who had completed the 12th grade, 9th - 11th grade, and the 8th grade or less. Respondents who had graduated from college and respondents who had completed some college rated the Public Work Place role lower than all other groups. The differences for the Formal Education Support role and the Public Work Place role were non-trivial. The other three differences were trivial.

Whether, if the respondent had completed the 12th grade or less, the respondent had a high school diploma or equivalent. There were three statistically significant differences between these two groups. Respondents who had a high school diploma rated the Formal Education Support Center role higher than respondents who did not. Respondents who had a high school diploma rated the Reference Library for personal information role and the Public Work Place role lower than respondents who did not (see Table 8). The differences for the Formal Education Support Center role and the Reference Library for personal information were trivial.

Whether, if the respondent had an associate degree, the respondent graduated from an academic program or an occupational program. There were too few responses to this question to permit group comparisons.

Marital status. There were five statistically significant, but trivial, differences in the role evaluations by different marital status groups (see Table 9). While all the differences are trivial, there is a pattern of differences between respondents who were widowed and the other groups. Respondents who were widowed and respondents who were divorced rated the Formal Education Support Center role higher than respondents who were never married. Respondents who were widowed rated the Community Activities Center role higher than respondents who were never married, the Community Information Center role higher than respondents who were married and respondents who were never married, the Public Work Place role higher than respondents who were married and respondents who were never married, and the Popular Materials Library role higher than respondents who were never married.

Whether a married respondent was currently living with a spouse. The number of married respondents currently not living with a spouse was too small to permit meaningful comparisons.

The number of people living in the home. There were no statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between the number of people living in the home and the respondents' evaluations of the roles.

Based on the number of people living in the home, the respondents were divided into five groups: respondents living in homes with one person, two people, three people, four people, and five or more people. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for these five groups indicated that there were three statistically significant differences among the groups (see Table 10). Respondents living in homes with two people rated the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role lower than respondents living in homes with one, three, or five or more people. Respondents living in homes with two people rated the Community Information Center role lower than respondents living in homes with one, four, or five or more people. Respondents living in homes with one person and respondents living in homes with five or more people rated the Public Work Place role higher than respondents living in homes with two, three, or four people. The differences for the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role and the Community Information Center role were trivial.

The number of preschool children living in the home. There were no statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between the number of preschool children living in the home and the respondent's evaluations of the roles.

Because of the low number of multiple preschool children in the home, the respondents were divided into two groups: respondents living in homes without any preschoolers and respondents in homes with one or more preschoolers. Comparisons between the groups indicated that there were five statistically significant, but trivial, differences (see Table 11). While the differences are trivial, there is a pattern. Respondents who were living in homes with preschoolers rated the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role, the Reference Library for personal information role, the Community Information Center role, the Independent Learning Center role, and the Public Work Place role higher than respondents who were living in homes without any preschoolers.

The number of students living in the home. There were no statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between the number of children living in the home and the respondent's evaluations of the roles.

Because of the low number of multiple students living in the home, the respondents were divided into two groups: respondents living in homes without any students and respondents in homes with one or more students. Comparisons between the groups indicated that there were two statistically significant, but trivial, differences (see Table 12). Respondents living in homes with one or more students rated the Formal Education Support Center role and the Independent Learning Center role higher than respondents living in homes without any students.

Whether the respondent was currently a student. There were no statistically significant differences in the evaluations of the importance of the roles by respondents who were students in school or in a training program and respondents who were not. (see Table 13).

Nature of the program of study. Dividing the respondents into groups based on the nature of their program of study produced groups too small for comparisons.

Primary language spoken in the household. The only non-English language spoken by the respondents with a frequency of occurrence sufficient for group comparison was Spanish. Comparisons of the Hispanic American sample to the African American sample and the Caucasian American sample have already been reported. Comparisons of Spanish speaking and English speaking Hispanic American households are reported later in Hispanic American section of this report.

Employment status. There were five statistically significant differences among the groups of respondents with different employment status (see Table 14). Respondents who were employed part time rated the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role higher than respondents who were unemployed. Respondents who were unemployed rated the Reference Library for business role lower than respondents who were employed full time, employed part time, and not in the work force; while respondents who were not in the work force rated this role higher than respondents who were retired. Respondents who were unemployed rated the Community Activities Center role lower than people who were not in the work force. Respondents who were not in the work force rated the Research Center role higher than respondents who were employed full time. Respondents who were not in the work force rated the Public Work Place role higher than respondents who were employed full time. The difference among the groups for the Reference Library for business role was non-trivial. The other four differences in the role evaluations were trivial.

Total annual household income. There was one statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficient. Total annual household income was inversely correlated (r = -.19) with the evaluation of the importance of the library's role as a Public Work Place. The lower the household income the higher the evaluation of the importance of the Public Work Place role; the higher the household income the lower the evaluation of the importance of the Public Work Place role.

Based on the amount of total annual household income, the respondents were divided into five groups: households with incomes of less than $15,000, $15,000 to $29,999, $30,000 to $44,999, $45,000 to $59,999, and $60,000 or more. Comparisons of the mean role importance scale scores for respondents based on their household income level indicated that there were four statistically significant differences among the groups (see Table 15). Respondents who lived in households with incomes of less than $15,000 rated the Research Center role, the Community Information Center role, and the Public Work Place role higher than all the other groups and these respondents also rated the Independent Learning Center role higher than all other groups with the exception of the those respondents living in households with incomes between $15,000 and $29,999. In addition, respondents who lived in households with incomes of more than $60,000 rated the Community Information Center role lower than respondents living in households with incomes of $15,000 to $29,999 and $30,000 to $44,999, rated the Independent Learning Center role lower than respondents living in households with incomes of $15,000 to $29,999, and rated the Public Work Place role lower than respondents living in households with incomes of $15,000 to $29,999. The differences among the groups for the Research Center role and the Independent Learning Center role were trivial.

Whether anyone in the household was disabled. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for respondents living in households with a disabled person and respondents living in households without a disabled person indicated that there was one statistically significant, but trivial, difference between the groups (see Table 16). Respondents living in households with a disable person rated the Public Work Place role higher than respondents living in households without a disabled person.

Whether the respondent was disabled. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for respondents who were disabled and respondents living in households with someone else disabled indicated that there were two statistically significant and non-trivial differences between the groups (see Table 17). Respondents who were disabled rated the Public Work Place role and the Popular Materials Library role higher than the respondents who were not disabled.

The nature of the disability. Dividing the disabled respondents into groups based on the nature of their disability produced groups too small for comparisons.

Whether the respondent voted in the last (1988) presidential election. Comparisons of the mean role importance scale scores of respondents who voted and respondents who did not vote in the 1988 election indicated that there were four statistically significant, but trivial, differences between the groups (see Table 18). Respondents who voted rated the Formal Education Support Center role and the Popular Materials Library role higher than respondents who did not vote. Respondents who did not vote rated the Reference Library for business role and the Independent Learning Center role higher than respondents who did vote.

The respondent's opinion about his/her current financial condition. Comparisons of the mean role importance scale scores for respondents based on their opinions about their current financial condition indicated that there were two statistically significant, but trivial, differences among the groups (see Table 19). Respondents who felt that their current financial condition was worse than last year rated the Research Center role and the Community Information Center role higher than respondents who felt that their current financial condition was better than last year.

The respondents's opinion about his/her financial condition next year. Comparisons of the mean role importance scale scores for respondents based on their opinions about their financial condition next year indicated that there was one statistically significant, but trivial, difference among the groups (see Table 20). Respondents who felt that their financial condition next year will be better than this year rated the Community Activities Center role lower than respondents who felt that their financial condition next year will be about the same as this year.

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE NATIONAL SAMPLE

Each of the role importance scales was tested for differences among respondents (using analysis of variance) based on the following library use behaviors: whether or not the respondent had gone to a public library in the past year, whether or not someone else had gone to a library to obtain materials for the respondent, whether or not the respondent had called a library for information in the past year, and a constructed measure of any kind of use of a public library - whether or not a respondent answered "yes" to any one of the three "use"questions. The results of these analyses are reported below.

Whether the respondent had gone to a public library in the past year. There were three statistically significant, but trivial, differences between respondents who had gone and respondents who had not gone to a public library in the past year (see Table 21). Respondents who had gone to a library rated the Formal Education Support Center role, the Reference Library for personal information role, and the Popular Materials Library role higher than respondents who had not gone to a library.

Respondents who indicated that they had gone to a library in the past year were also asked how many times they had gone to a library and were provided six numerical response categories which were converted into a six-point scale. This frequency of visit scale was also entered into correlation analyses with each of the role importance scales. The results of these analyses indicated that there were no statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients. The respondents' frequency of visiting a library was not related to their evaluations of the importance of the roles.

Whether someone else went to a public library for the respondent. There was one statistically significant, but trivial, difference between respondents who had someone else go to a library for them and respondents who did not (see Table 22). Respondents who had someone else go to a library for them rated the Formal Education Support Center role higher than respondents who did not.

Whether the respondent called a public library in the last year. There were two statistically significant, but trivial, differences between respondents who called a library for information and those that did not (see Table 23). Respondents who had called a library rated the Formal Education Support Center role and the Reference Library for personal information role higher than respondents who did not call a library for information.

Whether the respondent had made any use of a public library in the past year. There were three statistically significant, but trivial, differences between respondents who had made any use of a library and respondents who had not (see Table 24). Respondents who had made any use of a library rated the Formal Education Support Center role, the Reference Library for personal information role, and the Popular Materials Library role higher than respondents who had not made any use of a library.

THE NATIONAL SAMPLE'S OPINION ABOUT AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

The responses to the question about the amount of money that the community should spend on library services were tabulated and are reported in Table 25. These results indicated that 34.8% answered that the community should spend between $1 to $20 per capita on public libraries (this interval contains the national [1990] median of $16 per capita), while 52.4% of the respondents answered that the community should spend more than $20 per capita. Twelve and one-half per cent of the respondents were not sure and did not respond. The average per capita expenditure[13] that the respondents thought the community should spend annually on the public library was $34.16 - an amount twice as high as the national per capita expenditure.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION AMONG SEGMENTS OF THE NATIONAL SAMPLE ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

The respondents' opinions about the amount of money that the community should spend for library services were tested for differences among respondents (using analysis of variance) based on the same characteristics of the respondents as were identified on pages 19 and 20. The results of these analyses, reported in Table 26, indicated that there were seven statistically significant differences. These differences are reported below.

Region of country. Respondents living in the northeastern states were of the opinion that the community should spend about $42.33 per capita which was higher than the amounts selected by respondents living in the north central states ($29.33) and the south central states ($32.01).

Race/Ethnicity. Caucasian Americans were of the opinion that the community should spend about $33.65 per capita which was lower than the amounts selected by the Hispanic American group ($39.26) and the African American Group ($39.90). This difference was trivial.

Highest grade level completed. Respondents who had completed some college and respondents who had graduated from college were of the opinion that the community should spend, respectively, about $37.90 and $38.26 per capita which was higher than the amounts selected by respondents who had an 8th grade education or less ($27.42), completed 9th - 11th grades ($33.66), or completed the 12th grade ($30.61). This difference was trivial.

The number of preschoolers living in the home. Respondents living in homes with one or more preschool children were of the opinion that the community should spend about $37.77 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by respondents living in homes without any preschool children ($32.92). This difference was trivial.

---

[13] The average or mean of the scores was calculated using the mid-point of each interval; namely, $0, $10, $30, $50, $70, $90, and $110.

Whether the respondent was a student. Respondents who were students were of the opinion that the community should spend about $41.61 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by respondents who were not students ($33.20). This difference was trivial.

Whether the respondent voted in last (1988) presidential election. Respondents who voted in the last presidential election were of the opinion that the community should spend about $36.06 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by respondents who did not vote ($31.11). This difference was trivial.

The respondent's opinion about his/her financial condition next year. Respondents who felt that they will be better off next year were of the opinion that the community should spend about $36.53 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by respondents who felt that they will be about the same next year ($31.54) Respondents who felt that they will be worse off next year selected $34.05 which was not statistically different than the other two groups.

There were no statistically significant differences among the respondents based on size of community, gender, age, whether the respondent had a high school diploma, marital status, the number of people living in the home, whether there were any students in the home, employment status, total annual household income, whether there were any disabled persons in the household, whether the respondent was disabled, and opinions about financial conditions next year.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE NATIONAL SAMPLE

The respondents' selection of the amount of public spending for library services was tested for differences among respondents (using analysis of variance) based on the following library use behaviors: whether or not the respondent had gone to a public library in the past year, whether or not someone else had gone to a library to obtain materials for the respondent, whether or not the respondent had called a library for information in the past year, and a constructed measure of any kind of use of a public library - whether or not a respondent answered "yes" to any one of the three "use"questions. The results of these analyses, reported in Table 27, indicated that there were three statistically significant, but trivial, differences.

Respondents who had gone to a public library last year were of the opinion that the community should spend about $36.33 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by respondents who had not gone to a public library ($31.14).

The number of times that the respondents reported going to a library in the last year was entered into correlation analysis with the amount of public spending scale. The result of this analysis indicated that there was a statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficient (r = .18) indicating that, among library users, the more frequently users visited a library the higher the per capita support they thought the community should give to a library.

Respondents who called a library for information were of the opinion that the community should spend about $39.38 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by respondents who had not called a library ($32.48).

Respondents who had engaged in any use of a library in the past year were of the opinion that the community should spend about $35.76 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by respondents who had not engaged in any use of a library ($31.17).

The trivial nature of these differences indicates that while users of libraries felt that communities should spend more to support the library than nonusers did, the differences were not that great. The managerial significance of these data is that even nonusers of libraries feel that communities should spend about twice the amount of the current national median level of financial support for public libraries.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE ROLES AND THE OPINIONS ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN THE NATIONAL SAMPLE

In order to identify which of the roles of the public library the public appeared most willing to support financially, each of the role importance scales was entered into a correlation analysis with the suggested amount of public spending scale. None of these analyses resulted in a correlation coefficient that was statistically significant and non-trivial. These results suggest that the amount of public spending for library services the public appears willing to support is not related to any one role or group of roles. It appears that the public considers all roles to be equally worthy of financial support.

TABLE 1
THE PUBLIC'S EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE VARIOUS ROLES OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY

(N = 1001)

	$\bar{X}$	%
Formal Education Support Center	3.85	88.1
Independent Learning Center	3.81	84.6
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.81	83.2
Research Center	3.59	68.2
Community Information Center	3.58	65.6
Reference Library - Business	3.42	55.1
Public Work Place	3.38	52.4
Popular Materials Library	3.35	51.4
Reference Library - Personal	3.39	48.4
Community Activities Center	3.13	41.3

Note: N is the sample size and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. % represents the percentage of the sample that rated the role "very important." For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the % of respondents who rated the role "very important."

National Sample

TABLE 2
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS FROM DIFFERENT REGIONS OF THE COUNTRY*

	Northeast (N = 211)		South Central (N = 339)		North Central (N = 249)		West (N = 202)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.78	85.7	3.87	90.7	3.87	90.1	3.85	87.1	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.81	84.7	3.79	83.5	3.87	87.4	3.76	80.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.37	49.8	3.38	48.8	3.38	46.5	3.43	49.9	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.37	56.0	3.47	60.3	3.39	53.0	3.43	56.4	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.05	40.4	3.15	41.6	3.15	44.5	3.16	42.2	n.s.	
Research Center	3.61	71.6	3.63	72.2	3.51	62.5	3.59	71.3	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.62	72.5	3.63	70.9	3.50	59.2	3.55	62.1	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.84	85.8	3.83	87.4	3.75	80.8	3.83	86.5	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.34	51.9	3.35	52.2	3.37	51.1	3.47	57.8	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.36	51.6	3.34	50.9	3.36	54.9	3.36	50.9	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 3
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS FROM COMMUNITIES WITH DIFFERENT SIZE POPULATIONS*

	Over 1,000,000 (N = 67)		250,000 - 1,000,000 (N = 116)		Under 250,000 (N = 817)		α	R^2
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%		
Formal Education Support Center	3.86	89.1	3.94	95.4	3.83	87.8	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.73	78.1	3.82	84.0	3.81	84.6	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.38	53.9	3.42	50.7	3.38	48.0	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.49	64.5	3.52	59.4	3.40	55.8	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.11	38.3	3.19	43.3	3.12	42.3	n.s.	
Research Center	3.70	77.4	3.63	73.1	3.57	68.4	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.70	78.0	3.61	69.9	3.57	65.2	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.86	89.5	3.87	91.9	3.80	84.0	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.36	49.2	3.45	54.8	3.37	53.1	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.31	49.9	3.34	49.8	3.36	52.5	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 4
COMPARISONS BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE RESPONDENTS*

	Male (N = 474)		Female (N = 527)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.78	83.9	3.91	93.1	.000	.017
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.74	78.3	3.87	89.3	.000	.017
Reference Library - Personal	3.31	46.7	3.42	50.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.34	53.5	3.49	59.8	.002	.010
Community Activities Center	3.03	38.7	3.22	45.3	.001	.011
Research Center	3.48	62.6	3.69	75.8	.000	.022
Community Information Center	3.51	61.3	3.65	71.4	.001	.011
Independent Learning Center	3.77	82.0	3.85	88.1	.007	.007
Public Work Place	3.23	46.2	3.50	59.1	.000	.029
Popular Materials Library	3.21	43.0	3.48	60.1	.000	.027

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 5
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS FROM DIFFERENT AGE GROUPS[*]

	18-35 (N = 385)		36-50 (N = 260)		51-65 (N = 73)		66 and up (N = 173)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.83	87.8	3.88	90.4	3.89	90.6	3.80	85.6	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.84	85.3	3.80	83.1	3.78	84.4	3.77	82.0	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.39	46.6	3.40	49.4	3.40	49.4	3.33	51.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.50	59.6	3.38	52.7	3.40	56.4	3.31	56.3	.042	.009
Community Activities Center	3.12	39.9	3.01	35.3	3.29	50.8	3.20	49.4	.014	.011
Research Center	3.58	69.5	3.55	65.1	3.59	69.7	3.68	76.8	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.63	69.3	3.54	63.5	3.54	63.0	3.57	69.4	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.87	88.8	3.81	85.4	3.74	78.5	3.77	84.1	.014	.011
Public Work Place	3.34	50.2	3.28	45.5	3.48	60.2	3.50	63.9	.009	.012
Popular Materials Library	3.29	45.9	3.33	49.9	3.46	58.4	3.42	62.5	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 6
COMPARISONS AMONG AFRICAN AMERICAN, CAUCASIAN AMERICAN, AND HISPANIC AMERICAN RESPONDENTS[*]

	African Americans (N = 401)		Caucasian Americans (N = 846)		Hispanic Americans (N = 399)		α	R^2
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%		
Formal Education Support Center	3.94	96.5	3.85	88.6	3.92	93.8	.000	.010
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.94	95.7	3.80	83.4	3.91	93.0	.000	.022
Reference Library - Personal	3.70	74.8	3.38	47.8	3.52	61.1	.000	.037
Reference Library - Business	3.73	78.9	3.39	54.8	3.62	72.7	.000	.043
Community Activities Center	3.50	63.8	3.11	41.0	3.46	61.5	.000	.045
Research Center	3.79	84.6	3.56	67.5	3.79	84.2	.000	.030
Community Information Center	3.82	85.6	3.56	65.1	3.81	85.3	.000	.045
Independent Learning Center	3.89	93.1	3.81	84.7	3.95	95.4	.000	.018
Public Work Place	3.65	70.7	3.36	51.7	3.64	74.9	.000	.036
Popular Materials Library	3.52	61.5	3.37	52.3	3.46	57.4	.003	.007

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 7
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON HIGHEST GRADE LEVEL COMPLETED[*]

	8th grade or less (N = 74)		9th-11th grade (N = 106)		12th grade (N = 383)		Some college (N = 212)		Completed college (N = 222)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.86	89.8	3.65	74.2	3.84	89.4	3.94	94.5	3.86	88.2	.000	.025
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.86	91.7	3.79	83.4	3.81	84.6	3.84	86.6	3.76	78.8	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.67	75.8	3.44	57.3	3.36	46.0	3.38	44.0	3.33	44.9	.006	.014
Reference Library - Business	3.60	76.2	3.37	54.3	3.44	57.3	3.44	57.4	3.32	49.8	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.42	62.2	3.09	42.3	3.10	41.8	3.11	39.0	3.11	39.2	n.s.	
Research Center	3.80	82.8	3.60	68.8	3.62	70.8	3.59	69.6	3.47	64.0	.011	.013
Community Information Center	3.71	77.0	3.67	73.5	3.62	70.3	3.56	64.1	3.45	56.5	.006	.015
Independent Learning Center	3.88	92.3	3.87	88.2	3.84	86.8	3.79	83.5	3.75	80.3	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.63	70.9	3.64	71.7	3.43	54.3	3.29	47.2	3.17	42.0	.000	.039
Popular Materials Library	3.23	55.2	3.44	58.8	3.35	53.4	3.35	49.2	3.36	48.2	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 8
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON AWARD OF HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA*

	High school diploma (N = 400)		No high school diploma (N = 163)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.84	89.2	3.72	80.3	.025	.009
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.81	85.0	3.83	86.2	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.36	46.9	3.55	64.9	.004	.015
Reference Library - Business	3.43	58.2	3.49	61.9	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.14	42.3	3.15	50.4	n.s.	
Research Center	3.63	71.9	3.66	72.1	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.62	70.3	3.69	75.4	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.84	87.2	3.86	89.2	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.43	54.4	3.66	73.2	.001	.022
Popular Materials Library	3.38	54.8	3.29	54.5	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 9
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON MARITAL STATUS[*]

	Married (N = 590)		Widowed (N = 99)		Divorced (N = 104)		Never married (N = 203)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.85	88.0	3.92	94.0	3.91	94.9	3.78	85.3	.050	.008
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.78	82.5	3.85	90.6	3.89	90.3	3.81	82.7	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.38	47.7	3.48	61.0	3.36	49.6	3.36	45.1	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.42	55.8	3.48	65.7	3.32	54.5	3.44	56.3	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.11	41.5	3.36	55.5	3.19	41.5	3.05	38.1	.050	.008
Research Center	3.59	68.8	3.74	79.6	3.53	67.1	3.54	68.6	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.53	63.5	3.80	82.9	3.68	74.1	3.56	64.0	.001	.016
Independent Learning Center	3.78	83.0	3.88	90.2	3.88	90.7	3.85	87.0	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.36	51.1	3.65	69.7	3.42	55.6	3.31	50.1	.004	.014
Popular Materials Library	3.36	53.2	3.56	66.7	3.32	48.7	3.25	44.0	.018	.010

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 10
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN THE HOME*

	1 (N = 173)		2 (N = 333)		3 (N = 181)		4 (N = 182)		5 or more (N = 121)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.93	95.0	3.77	81.9	3.85	88.7	3.88	91.0	3.91	94.7	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.85	87.3	3.74	79.6	3.86	86.8	3.81	83.9	3.86	88.4	.018	.012
Reference Library - Personal	3.38	51.4	3.34	45.5	3.38	43.8	3.46	55.1	3.42	50.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.39	57.1	3.41	57.1	3.34	50.2	3.44	56.0	3.56	65.3	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.23	45.8	3.10	40.2	3.04	39.6	3.12	40.8	3.19	45.8	n.s.	
Research Center	3.64	75.9	3.57	68.5	3.57	67.1	3.58	67.4	3.61	70.7	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.69	72.9	3.48	60.6	3.55	62.1	3.66	73.6	3.66	70.4	.002	.017
Independent Learning Center	3.84	86.9	3.77	83.0	3.80	83.7	3.82	84.4	3.92	92.3	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.52	63.8	3.32	49.1	3.23	43.5	3.35	50.8	3.61	66.0	.000	.026
Popular Materials Library	3.40	55.2	3.35	53.4	3.24	41.4	3.34	51.7	3.47	58.3	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 11
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON NUMBER OF PRESCHOOLERS IN THE HOME[*]

	No preschoolers in the home (N = 633)		1 or more preschoolers in the home (N = 178)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.81	85.5	3.88	93.5	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.77	82.0	3.88	88.2	.014	.007
Reference Library - Personal	3.36	46.0	3.49	55.0	.024	.006
Reference Library - Business	3.41	55.5	3.49	60.6	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.08	40.1	3.19	43.4	n.s.	
Research Center	3.57	68.3	3.61	68.9	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.51	62.0	3.73	75.9	.000	.018
Independent Learning Center	3.78	83.5	3.89	89.1	.012	.008
Public Work Place	3.32	48.8	3.45	57.3	.046	.005
Popular Materials Library	3.32	50.5	3.40	53.0	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 12
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN THE HOME[*]

	No students in the home (N = 444)		1 or more students in the home (N = 371)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.77	83.3	3.90	92.1	.001	.014
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.77	81.7	3.83	85.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.35	45.7	3.43	50.6	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.41	56.6	3.44	56.5	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.11	40.5	3.09	41.4	n.s.	
Research Center	3.58	68.6	3.58	68.2	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.53	64.2	3.59	66.4	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.77	82.3	3.85	87.7	.043	.005
Public Work Place	3.31	49.0	3.40	52.6	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.34	51.7	3.34	50.3	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 13
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO ARE STUDENTS AND RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOT*

	Students (N = 103)		Non-students (N = 894)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.88	88.3	3.84	88.7	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.88	88.3	3.80	83.6	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.31	39.0	3.39	49.7	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.50	62.6	3.41	56.0	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.04	36.7	3.14	42.8	n.s.	
Research Center	3.51	64.1	3.60	70.2	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.63	67.5	3.58	66.4	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.89	89.3	3.80	84.7	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.39	50.6	3.38	53.2	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.25	44.1	3.36	52.8	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 14
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS WITH DIFFERENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS[*]

	Employed full time (N = 518)		Employed part time (N = 126)		Unemployed (N = 66)		Retired (N = 200)		Not in work force (N = 83)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.85	89.1	3.88	89.5	3.70	83.9	3.84	87.6	3.90	91.1	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.79	82.0	3.91	91.2	3.74	83.6	3.78	82.2	3.89	91.0	.022	.012
Reference Library - Personal	3.37	47.6	3.46	49.4	3.28	41.9	3.36	49.7	3.52	55.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.45	56.3	3.50	58.2	3.05	39.0	3.29	54.1	3.71	77.6	.000	.035
Community Activities Center	3.08	37.6	3.18	48.6	2.95	40.8	3.22	48.0	3.32	49.1	.050	.010
Research Center	3.54	65.9	3.59	71.6	3.56	68.8	3.69	76.4	3.72	74.3	.050	.010
Community Information Center	3.56	65.1	3.59	67.8	3.51	60.3	3.57	65.9	3.76	80.4	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.82	85.0	3.82	85.5	3.75	82.8	3.78	83.7	3.89	90.7	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.29	47.9	3.48	57.3	3.38	51.3	3.45	58.9	3.59	65.2	.002	.017
Popular Materials Library	3.30	47.8	3.45	57.3	3.24	44.7	3.44	60.1	3.43	55.6	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{x}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 15
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS WITH DIFFERENT ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME[*]

	Less than $15,000 (N = 140)		$15,000-$29,999 (N = 270)		$30,000-$44,999 (N = 223)		$45,000-$59,999 (N = 103)		$60,000 or more (N = 116)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.80	88.3	3.84	90.2	3.90	92.7	3.94	94.1	3.80	82.8	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.89	90.4	3.82	85.5	3.81	84.5	3.77	82.9	3.73	76.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.51	61.3	3.37	48.7	3.42	50.3	3.35	43.9	3.36	46.8	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.51	66.3	3.42	54.8	3.47	59.7	3.27	46.2	3.37	55.9	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.29	53.5	3.13	46.0	3.12	39.1	3.10	38.2	3.04	34.6	n.s.	
Research Center	3.76	79.8	3.59	69.7	3.57	68.3	3.59	67.1	3.46	63.9	.020	.014
Community Information Center	3.76	78.8	3.57	66.1	3.59	67.7	3.51	59.8	3.42	57.1	.002	.020
Independent Learning Center	3.92	93.3	3.84	87.1	3.81	84.2	3.77	82.5	3.71	79.2	.015	.015
Public Work Place	3.72	75.1	3.39	54.9	3.34	50.5	3.22	43.8	3.18	38.5	.000	.045
Popular Materials Library	3.46	58.8	3.27	48.9	3.33	51.1	3.41	56.1	3.38	50.6	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 16
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO LIVE IN HOUSEHOLDS WITH INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE DISABILITIES AND RESPONDENTS WHO DO NOT*

	Disabilities (N = 144)		No disabilities (N = 836)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.88	89.6	3.84	88.6	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.82	84.2	3.80	83.9	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.44	55.1	3.37	47.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.42	58.9	3.42	56.2	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.19	49.1	3.12	40.6	n.s.	
Research Center	3.69	75.5	3.57	68.7	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.62	72.5	3.57	65.4	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.83	88.5	3.81	84.6	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.52	61.6	3.34	50.9	.016	.006
Popular Materials Library	3.43	57.0	3.33	50.7	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 17
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO ARE DISABLED AND RESPONDENTS LIVING IN A HOUSEHOLD WHERE SOMEONE ELSE IS DISABLED[*]

	Respondent (N = 78)		Someone else (N = 55)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.85	86.5	3.90	91.9	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.82	86.9	3.79	78.7	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.48	59.0	3.33	46.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.48	65.6	3.23	43.1	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.21	51.5	3.09	40.5	n.s.	
Research Center	3.77	82.0	3.55	64.5	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.67	74.5	3.52	68.1	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.84	86.9	3.79	88.3	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.66	70.7	3.32	48.0	.007	.056
Popular Materials Library	3.55	63.5	3.22	42.1	.014	.047

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{x}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 18
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO VOTED AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT VOTE IN THE 1988 ELECTION[*]

	Voted (N = 628)		Did not vote (N = 366)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.88	89.8	3.79	86.8	.004	.008
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.79	83.7	3.83	86.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.38	47.4	3.39	50.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.38	54.3	3.49	61.0	.039	.004
Community Activities Center	3.15	43.2	3.10	40.4	n.s.	
Research Center	3.57	68.0	3.62	71.9	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.56	65.3	3.62	68.9	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.77	82.6	3.88	90.0	.002	.010
Public Work Place	3.36	51.1	3.40	55.9	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.42	54.5	3.25	48.0	.001	.011

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 19
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON PERSONAL FINANCIAL SITUATION COMPARED TO LAST YEAR[*]

	Better off (N = 252)		Worse off (N = 233)		About the same (N = 507)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.83	87.9	3.85	87.7	3.86	89.5	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.78	81.0	3.79	84.1	3.83	86.1	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.44	51.5	3.40	51.2	3.36	46.2	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.46	59.0	3.36	52.2	3.43	57.8	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.11	41.7	3.15	42.9	3.13	42.2	n.s.	
Research Center	3.48	65.4	3.67	75.1	3.61	69.0	.012	.009
Community Information Center	3.54	65.5	3.68	71.9	3.57	65.2	.040	.007
Independent Learning Center	3.81	85.4	3.86	87.3	3.79	84.2	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.31	49.1	3.41	53.5	3.40	54.9	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.26	46.1	3.41	56.2	3.38	53.1	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

National Sample

TABLE 20
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON PERSONAL FINANCIAL SITUATION EXPECTED FOR NEXT YEAR[*]

	Better off (N = 456)		Worse off (N = 77)		About the same (N = 426)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.85	89.1	3.76	79.8	3.85	89.5	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.81	82.0	3.70	81.3	3.82	85.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.38	45.6	3.25	42.7	3.42	53.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.44	57.4	3.32	54.6	3.42	56.0	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.05	36.4	3.14	48.4	3.21	46.5	.037	.007
Research Center	3.57	69.6	3.48	65.7	3.63	70.3	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.59	68.4	3.60	64.3	3.57	65.1	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.82	86.1	3.81	84.4	3.81	84.5	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.36	50.3	3.32	53.8	3.42	56.1	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.31	48.6	3.30	52.2	3.41	56.0	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 21
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO VISITED AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT VISIT THE PUBLIC LIBRARY IN THE LAST YEAR*

	Visited library (N = 572)		Did not visit library (N = 423)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.90	91.8	3.78	84.4	.000	.014
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.83	85.3	3.78	82.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.43	50.6	3.32	46.4	.012	.006
Reference Library - Business	3.44	56.5	3.39	57.2	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.15	43.4	3.10	40.4	n.s.	
Research Center	3.56	68.6	3.63	71.3	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.57	65.0	3.60	69.1	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.82	85.4	3.80	85.1	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.34	50.0	3.42	56.7	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.41	53.5	3.28	50.2	.015	.006

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 22
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS BASED ON WHETHER SOMEONE ELSE WENT TO THE PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR THEM IN THE LAST YEAR*

	Yes (N = 214)		No (N = 785)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.93	93.5	3.82	87.4	.006	.008
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.81	83.1	3.81	84.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.41	45.7	3.38	49.6	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.36	53.4	3.44	57.8	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.05	38.9	3.15	43.1	n.s.	
Research Center	3.59	66.9	3.59	70.3	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.58	66.5	3.58	66.8	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.82	87.8	3.81	84.5	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.30	47.4	3.40	54.5	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.32	48.9	3.36	52.9	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 23
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO CALLED THE PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR INFORMATION IN THE LAST YEAR AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT[*]

	Called library (N = 232)		Did not call library (N = 768)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.93	94.2	3.82	87.1	.002	.009
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.84	86.5	3.80	83.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.47	52.7	3.36	47.5	.032	.005
Reference Library - Business	3.47	58.4	3.41	56.4	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.17	42.9	3.12	42.0	n.s.	
Research Center	3.54	63.7	3.60	71.4	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.64	70.4	3.56	65.4	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.81	84.7	3.81	85.4	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.40	52.6	3.37	53.1	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.40	52.8	3.34	51.8	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 24
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO IN ANY WAY USED THE PUBLIC LIBRARY IN THE LAST YEAR AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT[*]

	Users (N = 634)		Non-users (N = 367)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.89	90.7	3.78	85.3	.001	.011
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.82	84.6	3.79	83.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.43	50.2	3.31	46.1	.006	.008
Reference Library - Business	3.43	56.3	3.40	57.7	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.16	43.4	3.09	39.9	n.s.	
Research Center	3.57	68.3	3.62	71.8	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.57	65.6	3.60	68.4	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.81	85.1	3.82	85.5	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.35	50.6	3.43	57.2	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.39	53.8	3.28	48.8	.029	.005

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 25
THE PUBLIC'S OPINIONS ABOUT LEVELS OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARY SERVICES

Amount	Frequency	Percent	Adjusted Percent*
$ 0	3	.3	.4
$ 1 - $20	348	34.8	39.8
$21 - $40	257	25.7	29.3
$41 - $60	127	12.7	14.5
$61 - $80	54	5.4	6.2
$81 - $100	42	4.2	4.8
$101 -	44	4.4	5.0
Don't Know	125	12.5	Missing
Total	1001		

---

* Note: Percentages recalculated with missing respondents excluded.

TABLE 26
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS[*]

	N	$\bar{X}$			C.I.
Entire Sample	876	$34.17			$32.30 - $36.05

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Region of country			.000	.027	
Northeast	185	$42.33			$37.69 - $46.97
South Central	294	$32.01			$28.85 - $35.18
North Central	214	$29.33			$25.99 - $32.68
West	180	$35.05			$31.02 - $39.07
Size of community			n.s.	--	
Over 1,000,000	60	$39.61			$31.51 - $47.71
250,000 - 1,000,000	104	$34.47			$28.44 - $40.31
Under 250,000	710	$33.67			$31.64 - $35.71
Gender			n.s.	--	
Males	414	$35.88			$33.08 - $38.67
Females	461	$32.64			$30.12 - $35.16
Age			n.s.	--	
18 - 35	356	$36.37			$33.28 - $39.47
36 - 50	236	$34.21			$30.87 - $37.55
51 - 65	149	$32.27			$27.91 - $36.63
66 and up	126	$29.76			$24.73 - $34.81

---

[*] Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 26 (continued)
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Race/Ethnicity			.002	.009	
African Americans	357	$39.90			$36.13 - $43.67
Caucasian Americans	737	$33.65			$31.68 - $35.61
Hispanic Americans	321	$39.26			$35.21 - $43.30
Highest grade level completed			.003	.018	
8th grade or less	49	$27.42			$20.25 - $34.59
9th - 11th grade	84	$33.66			$26.30 - $41.02
12th grade	341	$30.61			$27.72 - $33.50
Some college	197	$37.90			$34.00 - $41.80
Completed college	200	$38.26			$34.40 - $42.13
High school diploma or equivalent			n.s.	--	
Yes	356	$29.61			$26.86 - $32.36
No	118	$34.42			$28.42 - $40.43
Marital status			n.s.	--	
Married	523	$33.03			$30.69 - $35.37
Widowed	65	$31.08			$24.25 - $37.91
Divorced	97	$33.40			$28.00 - $38.80
Never married	186	$38.60			$34.06 - $43.16

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 26 (continued)
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS[*]

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
# of people living in the home			n.s.	--	
one	132	$35.21			$30.16 - $40.26
two	290	$31.33			$28.12 - $34.54
three	168	$33.80			$29.58 - $38.03
four	165	$38.93			$34.44 - $43.43
five or more	113	$32.93			$28.03 - $37.84
# of preschool children in the home			.050	.005	
No preschoolers	571	$32.92			$30.66 - $35.18
One or more preschoolers	161	$37.77			$33.19 - $42.35
# of students in the home			n.s.	--	
No students	393	$33.69			$30.74 - $36.63
One or more students	340	$34.02			$31.25 - $36.79
Whether the respondents were students			.006	.009	
students	95	$41.61			$35.73 - $47.48
non-students	779	$33.20			$31.23 - $35.17

---

[*] Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 26 (continued)
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Employment Status			n.s.	--	
Employed full time	478	$34.56			$32.12 - $37.00
Employed part time	116	$36.27			$30.93 - $41.62
Unemployed	56	$33.91			$26.26 - $41.56
Retired	152	$31.37			$26.58 - $36.16
Not in work force	68	$33.05			$26.00 - $40.11
Annual household income			n.s.	--	
Less than $15,000	110	$32.08			$26.06 - $38.10
$15,000 - $29,999	246	$32.37			$28.72 - $36.02
$30,000 - $44,999	210	$36.81			$33.13 - $40.50
$45,000 - $59,999	94	$35.80			$30.07 - $41.53
$60,000 or more	107	$36.31			$31.80 - $40.82
Disabled person in household			n.s.	--	
Yes	123	$36.04			$30.24 - $41.83
No	740	$33.94			$31.95 - $35.93
Respondent disabled			n.s.	--	
Yes	65	$37.94			$29.37 - $46.50
No	48	$31.39			$23.90 - $38.88

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 26 (continued)
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Voted in '88 election			.012	.007	
Yes	547	\$36.06			\$33.65 - \$38.47
No	326	\$31.11			\$28.12 - \$34.09
Current financial situation			n.s.	--	
Better off than last year	227	\$34.29			\$30.61 - \$37.96
Worse off than last year	203	\$32.39			\$28.42 - \$36.37
About the same	438	\$35.05			\$32.40 - \$37.71
Future financial situation			.047	.007	
Better off next year	424	\$36.53			\$33.69 - \$39.38
Worse off next year	62	\$34.05			\$27.21 - \$40.89
About the same	365	\$31.54			\$28.79 - \$34.27

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 27
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES BETWEEN LIBRARY USERS AND NON-USERS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	C.I.
Entire Sample	876	$34.17	$32.30 - $36.05

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Respondent went to public library last year			.008	.008	
Yes	521	$36.33			$33.90 - $38.75
No	347	$31.14			$28.16 - $34.12
Someone else went to library for respondent			n.s.	--	
Yes	191	$36.31			$32.55 - $40.07
No	683	$33.56			$31.39 - $35.72
Respondent called library for information			.002	.011	
Yes	217	$39.38			$35.45 - $43.32
No	657	$32.78			$30.36 - $34.60
Respondent used library in any way last year			.022	.006	
Yes	572	$35.76			$33.47 - $38.05
No	303	$31.17			$27.92 - $34.42

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by groups of respondents by library use.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 19. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

PART II. THE SURVEY OF AFRICAN AMERICANS

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

The African American sample included 401 respondents. The data from this sample were weighted to ensure that the demographic characteristics of the weighted sample conformed to the latest available Census Bureau estimates of the characteristics of the national African American population for age, gender, race, formal education attainment, and region of country. The demographic characteristics of the sample are as follows:[1]

Region of country[2]	20.4%	northeast
	51.5%	south central
	19.3%	north central
	8.8%	west
% of community which is African American[3]	53.9%	high (over 25% African American)
	29.7%	moderate (5% - 25% African American)
	16.5%	low (less than 5% African American)
Gender	44.1%	male
	55.9%	female

---

[1] The frequency distributions for the responses to all the questions in the interview are presented in the Appendix for this report. The Appendix is a separately bound publication.

[2] These regional areas are defined by The Gallup Organization as follows: northeast states = Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont; south central states = Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Washington D.C., Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia; north central states = Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin; western states = Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

[3] As part of the sampling procedure for the African American sample, the Gallup Organization identified telephone area codes for areas that contained certain estimated proportions of African Americans in the population. These strata were classified as heavy (.26 - 1.00), moderate (.05 - .25), and light (0 - .04). These strata were not based on the size of the community but rather on the estimated proportion of the community, regardless of its size, which is African American. Using this rule, an inner city neighborhood which is predominately African American could be included in the same strata as a rural community which is predominantly African American.

Age	44.1%	18 - 35 years
	26.4%	36 - 50 years
	11.8%	51 - 65 years
	16.8%	66 years and older
	.9%	missing
Grade level completed	18.0%	8th grade or less
	14.7%	9th - 11th grade
	37.7%	12th grade
	14.6%	some college
	3.1%	associate degree
	8.0%	bachelor's degree
	2.6%	master's degree
	.9%	professional/doctoral
	.6%	missing
High school diploma or equivalent[4]	38.1%	yes
	32.2%	no
	29.8%	missing
Marital status	40.9%	married
	12.8%	widowed
	17.4%	divorced
	28.4%	never married
	.5%	missing
Living with spouse	35.3%	yes
	5.6%	no
	59.1%	missing
# of people living at home	16.5%	one
	27.8	two
	22.0%	three
	16.8%	four
	10.4%	five
	5.8%	six or more
	.7%	missing

---

[4] This question was asked only of those respondents who answered that they had completed 12 grades of school or less.

# of preschool children at home	57.8%	zero
	19.2%	one
	2.8%	two
	.8%	three
	.8%	four
	18.7%	missing
# of school children at home	38.3%	zero
	27.5%	one
	10.0%	two
	4.2%	three
	2.4%	four or more
	17.6%	missing
Respondents who were students	0.7%	high school
	1.5%	non-academic program
	5.7%	college students
	1.0%	graduate students
	91.1%	missing
Primary language spoken at home	98.9%	English
	.3%	Spanish
	.8%	missing
Employment status	47.1%	employed full-time
	11.8%	employed part-time
	15.7%	unemployed
	15.7%	retired
	9.2%	not in work force
	.6%	missing

Household income	14.7%	less than $5,000
	11.9%	$ 5,000 - $ 9,999
	11.3%	$10,000 - $14,999
(Median interval)	10.1%	$15,000 - $19,999
	7.8%	$20,000 - $24,999
	7.9%	$25,000 - $29,999
	3.6%	$30,000 - $34,999
	8.9%	$35,000 - $39,999
	1.9%	$40,000 - $44,999
	2.2%	$45,000 - $49,999
	2.1%	$50,000 - $54,999
	2.2%	$55,000 - $59,999
	1.7%	$60,000 - $64,999
	.7%	$65,000 - $69,999
	1.0%	$70,000 - $74,999
	2.7%	$75,000 or more
	9.3%	missing
Disabled person in household	21.6%	yes
	76.7%	no
	1.7%	missing
Respondent disabled	5.7%	yes
	15.0%	someone else
	79.4%	missing
Nature of disability	1.0%	sight
	4.3%	mobility
	94.7%	missing
Voted in '88 election	52.4%	yes
	47.6%	no
	.1%	missing
Current financial situation	21.5%	better off than last year
	34.3%	worse off than last year
	43.8%	about the same
	.4%	missing
Future financial situation	63.2%	better off next year
	4.9%	worse off next year
	26.4%	about the same
	5.5%	missing.

LIBRARY USE AMONG THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

The data indicated that 51.1% of the sample had personally gone to a public library in the past year, 13.4% of the sample reported that someone else had obtained materials for them, and 15.8% of the sample had called a library for information. Controlling for overlap among these activities, it was determined that 54.1% of the sample had in some way used a public library in the last year while 45.9% of the sample reported no use of a library.

EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

The responses to the role evaluation questions were analyzed in two ways: first, mean scores for the role importance scales were calculated; and second, the percentages of respondents who for each role selected the category "very important" were tabulated. While the mean importance scale score yields a more precise estimate of the respondents' evaluations of the importance of a role, the percentage of respondents who selected the category "very important" is the more easily understood and communicated estimate of the importance of a role. All of the tables presenting results of role evaluations present both the mean scale scores and the percentage "scores."

The results of the role evaluations are reported in Table 28 in ranked order from the role receiving the highest mean importance scale score to the role receiving the lowest mean importance scale score. These results can be interpreted in two ways: first, the scores for any given role can be interpreted in terms of their position or standing on the four-point importance scale (an absolute assessment); and second, the scores for any given role can be interpreted in terms of their ranking relative to the scores received by the other roles (a relative assessment). For example, more than half of the sample (65.1%) rated the Popular Materials Library role as "very important" with a mean score of 3.52, but this rating places the role in ninth position of importance compared to the mean scores received by the other roles. The reader should note that the ranking by mean score is not the same as the ranking by the percentage "score." The reader should also note that the distance between the mean scores for some of the roles is quite small indicating that, while one role is ranked higher or lower than another role, for all practical purposes the roles are about equal in importance. The same observation could also be made for the percentage "scores."

The results in Table 28 indicate that a majority of the African American sample considered each of the ten roles to be "very important." Of these, however, the Formal Education Support Center role, the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role, Independent Learning Center role, the Community Information Center role, and the Research Center role received the highest ratings of importance. These most important roles were closely followed by the Reference Library roles for Business and Personal information. These results indicate that the African American respondents considered the public library's missions to support the educational aspirations and information needs of the community to be the most important missions of the library in their community.

In evaluating these results the reader should also keep in mind some of the anomalies in the role statements and the public's interpretations of the role statements that were discussed on pages 17-19.

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY DIFFERENT SEGMENTS OF THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

The respondents' opinions about the importance of each role were tested for differences between or among groups of respondents using analysis of variance.[5] The different groups of respondents were identified by, or created from, the following characteristics: the region of the country where the respondent lived; the relative size (in %) of the African American population in the community in which the respondent lived; the gender of the respondent; the age of the respondent; the highest grade level of education completed by the respondent and, if the 12th grade or less, whether the respondent has a high school diploma or equivalent; whether the respondent was a high school graduate; whether, if the respondent had an associate degree, the respondent graduated from an academic program or an occupational program; the respondent's current marital status and, if married, whether the respondent was currently living with a spouse; the number of people living in the respondent's home; the number of preschool children living in the home; the number of students living in the home; whether the respondent was currently a student and, if so, the nature of the program of study; the primary language spoken at home; the respondent's current employment status; total annual household income; whether anyone in the household was disabled; whether the respondent was disabled and, if so, the nature of the disability; whether the respondent voted in the last (i.e., 1988) presidential election; the respondent's opinion about his or her current financial situation; the respondent's opinion about his or her financial situation next year; whether the respondent personally went to a public library in the past year and, if so, how many times; whether anyone else went to a library for the respondent; whether the respondent called a library for information in the past year; and whether the respondent made any use of a library in the past year.

---

[5] Analysis of variance is a statistical procedure for testing whether the observed differences among group means for each role evaluation occurred by chance or because the groups differed in their evaluations of the importance of the role. A statistically significant difference among the group means is defined as one whose probability of occurring by chance (the α level reported in the tables) is so low that we choose to conclude that the difference did not occur by chance but that it occurred because the groups differed in their evaluation of the role. All differences with an α level of .05 or less (that is, the probability that the difference occurred by chance is 5 out of a hundred or less) are considered to be statistically significant. The α levels for all statistically significant differences are reported in the tables. All differences with an α level greater than .05 (that is, the probability that the difference occurred by chance is greater than 5 out of a hundred) are considered to be non-significant and are designated as such in the table with the initials n.s.

A non-trivial difference is defined as a statistically significant difference whose magnitude of difference is sufficiently large that it warrants attention for possible usefulness in managerial decision making. By contrast, a trivial difference is defined as a statistically significant difference whose magnitude of difference is so small or trivial as to be of questionable value in managerial decision making. Deciding whether a statistically significant difference is trivial or non-trivial is a judgement call. We have adopted the rule that if R^2, the coefficient of determination, is equal to or greater than .02 the difference is considered to be non-trivial. The coefficient of determination measures the amount of variation in the role evaluation scores that is explained by the group differences - the larger the coefficient of determination, the more meaningful the difference. The coefficients of determination for all statistically significant differences are reported in the tables so assessments about triviality can be made.

In the preceding analyses, the quantitative characteristics of the respondents (age, highest grade level of education completed, the number of people living in the home, the number of preschool children living in the home, the number of students living in the home, and total household income) were grouped into intervals (e.g., respondents 18 to 35 years old, respondents 36 to 50 years old, etc.) and the mean role importance scale scores for these groups were compared for differences using analysis of variance. This was done in order to facilitate comparisons to local data which oftentimes are available only in this grouped format. Another way of analyzing whether any of these characteristics of the respondents is related to the respondents' evaluations of the importance of the roles is by means of correlation analysis[6] which tests for the presence of a trend between the characteristic and the role importance score. For example, as the total annual income of the respondents increases does the evaluation of the importance of a role tend to increase or decrease? In order to determine if trends such as this exist, each of these quantitative characteristics of the respondents was also entered into a correlation analysis with each of the role importance scales.

While the results of the analyses of variance with the grouped data and the results of the correlation analyses with the ungrouped data are complementary, it should be noted that the correlation analyses are not always sensitive to a difference between two or more groups which might exist. Consequently, the results of the two tests sometimes do not agree. The results of both sets of analyses are reported below.

Region of the country. There were no statistically significant differences in the role evaluations by respondents living in the four regions of the country (see Table 29).

% of community which is African American. There were five statistically significant differences among the evaluations of the roles by respondents living in areas with different percentages of African Americans in the community (see Table 30). These results indicate that respondents living in the communities with moderate percentages (5% - 25%) evaluated the Reference Library roles both for business information and for personal information higher in importance than respondents living in communities with high percentages (over 25%) and low percentages (less than 5%). Respondents living in communities with high and moderate percentages evaluated the Community Information Center role higher than respondents living in communities with low

---

[6] A correlation coefficient is an index of the strength of the relationship between two quantitative variables. The coefficient can take a value from -1.00 (indicating a perfect inverse relationship) to 0.00 (indicating the absence of any relationship) to +1.00 (indicating a perfect positive relationship). Typically, correlation coefficients appear either as a negative decimal value (indicating that high scores for one variable are associated with low scores for the other variable) or as a positive decimal value (indicating that high scores for one variable are associated with high scores for the other variable). The higher the decimal value, the stronger the relationship.

A statistically significant relationship is defined as one whose probability of occurrence by chance is so low that we choose to conclude that it did not occur by chance but that it occurred because the two variables are related. A non-trivial relationship is defined as a statistically significant relationship of sufficient strength that it warrants attention for possible usefulness in managerial decision making. In this report, correlation coefficients equal to or greater than ±.15 are considered to be non-trivial.

percentages. The differences among the evaluations of the Public Work Place role were statistically trivial, however it appears that respondents living in communities with moderate percentages rated this role higher than the respondents living in communities with low and high percentages. Respondents living in communities with moderate percentages rated the Popular Materials Library role higher than respondents living in communities with low percentages.

Gender. There were no statistically significant differences among the evaluations of the roles by male and female respondents (see Table 31).

Age. There were two statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between the age of the respondents and their evaluations of the importance of the roles. The age of the respondents was positively related to the respondents' evaluations of the importance of the Reference Library for personal information role (r = .17) and the Public Work Place role (r = .15).

The respondents were also divided into four age groups: 18 - 35 years old; 36 - 50 years old; 51 - 65 years old; and over 65 years old. Comparisons of the mean importance scale sores for these four groups indicated that there were two statistically significant and non-trivial differences among the groups (see Table 32). Respondents who were 18 - 35 years old gave the Reference Library for personal information role a lower rating than did the other age groups. Respondents who were 51 years or older gave the Public Work Place role a higher rating than did respondents who were younger than 51 years.

Highest grade level completed. There was one statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficient. The highest grade level completed by the respondents was inversely related to the respondents' evaluations of the importance of the Reference Library for personal information role (r = -.16). The lower the grade level completed, the higher the rating of the importance of the Reference Library for personal information role; the higher the grade level completed the lower the rating of the importance of the Reference Library for personal information role

The respondents were also divided into five groups based on the number of grades completed: 8th grade or less; 9th - 11th grade, 12th grade, some college, and college graduates. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for these five groups indicated that there were four statistically significant and non-trivial differences (see Table 33). Respondents who had some college and respondents who had graduated college gave the Reference Library for personal information lower ratings than did the respondents who had a 12th grade education or less. Respondents who had completed the 9th - 11th grades gave the Reference Library for business role a lower rating than did respondents who had an 8th grade education or less and respondents who had completed the 12th grade. Respondents who had completed the 8th grade or less, respondents who had completed the 9th - 11th grades, and respondents who had completed the 12th grade of high school gave the Independent Learning Center role a higher rating than respondents who had completed some college; respondents who had completed the 9th - 11th grades gave the role a higher rating than did respondents who had graduated from college. Respondents who had completed the 8th grade or less gave the Public Work Place role a higher rating than did respondents who had completed the 9th - 11th grades, respondents who had completed some college, and respondents who had graduated from college.

Whether, if the respondent had completed the 12th grade or less, the respondent had a high school diploma or equivalent. There were two statistically significant differences among the evaluations of the roles by respondents who had a high school diploma and respondents who did not (see Table 34). There was a trivial difference between the two groups on their evaluation of the Formal Education Support Center role; respondents who had a high school diploma gave the role a slightly higher evaluation. The two groups also differed on their evaluation of the Public Work Place role; respondents who did not have a high school diploma gave the role a higher evaluation.

Whether, if the respondent had an associate degree, the respondent graduated from an academic program or an occupational program. The number of responses to this question was too small to permit group comparisons.

Marital status. There were four statistically significant differences in the role evaluations by different marital status groups (see Table 35). Respondents who never married rated the Formal Education Support Center role, the Community Activities Center role, the Community Information Center role, and the Public Work Place role lower than respondents who were married, widowed, or divorced.

Whether a married respondent was currently living with a spouse. There were no statistically significant differences among the evaluations of the roles by married respondents who were living with their spouses and respondents who were not living with their spouses (see Table 36).

The number of people living in the home. There were no statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between the number of people living at home and the respondents' evaluations of the roles.

Based on the number of people living in the home, the respondents were also divided into five groups: respondents living in homes with one person, two people, three people, four people, and five or more people. Comparisons among these groups indicated that there were two statistically significant differences (see Table 37). Respondents who lived in homes with two people rated the Formal Education Support Center role lower than the other groups. Respondents who lived alone rated the Community Activities Center role lower than the other groups.

The number of preschool children living in the home. There were no statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between the number of preschool children living at home and the respondents' evaluations of the roles.

Because of the low number of multiple preschoolers in the home, the respondents were divided into two groups: respondents living in homes without any preschoolers and respondents living in homes with one or more preschoolers. Comparisons between the groups indicated that there were two statistically significant, but trivial differences (see Table 38). Respondents living in homes with one or more preschoolers rated the Formal Education Support Center role and the Popular Materials Library role higher than respondents who lived in homes without any preschoolers.

The number of students living in the home. There were no statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between the number of children living at home and the respondents' evaluations of the roles.

Because of the low number of multiple students in the home, the respondents were divided into two groups: respondents living in homes without any students and respondents living in homes with one or more students. Comparisons between the groups indicated that there were two statistically significant, but trivial differences (see Table 39). Respondents living in homes with one or more students rated the Independent Learning Center role and the Popular Materials Library role higher than respondents who lived in homes without any students.

Whether the respondent was currently a student. There were no statistically significant differences among the evaluations of the roles by respondents who were currently students or enrolled in a training program and respondents who were not. (See Table 40).

Nature of the program of study. The number of responses to this question was too small to permit group comparisons.

Employment status. There were four statistically significant and non-trivial differences among the evaluations of the roles by respondents with different employment status (see Table 41). Respondents who were employed part time rated the Formal Education Support Center role lower than the other groups. Retired respondents rated the Reference Library role for personal information higher than respondents who were employed full time. Respondents who were employed full time rated the Community Activities Center role lower than the other groups. Retired respondents rated the Public Work Place role higher than the other groups.

Total annual household income. There were two statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients. The total annual household income of the respondents was inversely related to the respondents' evaluations of the importance of the Reference Library for personal information role ($r = -.19$) and the Public Work Place role ($r = -.17$). The lower the respondents' household income the higher the ratings of the importance of the Reference Library for personal information role and the importance of the Public Work Place role; the higher the respondents' household income the lower the ratings of the importance of the Reference Library for personal information role and the importance of the Public Work Place role.

Based on the amount of total household income, the respondents were divided into five groups: respondents living in households with incomes of less than $10,000, $10,000 to $19,999, $20,000 to $29,999, $30,000 to $39,999, and above $40,000. Comparisons among these groups indicated that there were three statistically significant differences among the groups (see Table 42). Respondents who lived in households with incomes of less than $10,000 rated the Reference Library role for personal information higher than respondents living households with incomes of $20,000 or more, and respondents in households with incomes of $10,000 - $19,999 rated this role higher than respondents in households with incomes of $30,000 - $39,999. Respondents living in households with incomes of less than $10,000 rated the Communities Activities Center role higher than any other income group. Respondents living in households with incomes of less than $10,000 rated the Research Center role higher than respondents in households with incomes of $20,000 - $29,999.

Whether anyone in the household was disabled. There were three statistically significant differences between the evaluations of the roles by respondents living in households with a disabled person and respondents living in households without a disabled person (see Table 43). Respondents living in households with a disabled person rated the Reference Library role for personal information, the Community Activities Center role, and the Research Center role higher than respondents living in households without a disabled person. The differences between the two groups on the Reference Library role and the Research Center role were statistically trivial.

Whether the respondent was disabled. There were no statistically significant differences between the evaluations of the roles by respondents who were disabled and respondents who were not disabled (see Table 44).

The nature of the disability. The number of responses to this question was too small to permit group comparisons.

Whether the respondent voted in the last (1988) presidential election. There were two statistically significant difference among the evaluations of the roles by respondents who voted and respondents who did not vote in the last presidential election (see Table 45). Respondents who voted rated the Formal Education Support Center role and the Community Information Center role higher than respondents who did not vote. Both of these differences were statistically trivial.

The respondent's opinion about his/her current financial condition. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for respondents based on their opinions about their current financial condition indicated that there were four statistically significant differences among the groups (see Table 46). Respondents who felt that their current financial condition was worse than last year rated the Community Activities Center role, the Research Center role, the Community Information Center role, and the Popular Materials Library role higher than respondents who felt that their current financial condition was about the same as last year. The differences between these groups on the Research Center role and the Popular Materials Library role were statistically trivial.

The respondents's opinion about his/her financial condition next year. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for respondents based on their opinions about their financial condition next year indicated that there was one statistically significant difference among the groups (see Table 47). Respondents who felt that their financial condition next year will be better than this year rated the Reference Library role for business information higher than respondents who felt that their financial condition next year will be about the same as this year.

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

Each of the role importance scales was tested for differences among respondents (using analysis of variance) based on the following library use behaviors: whether or not the respondent had gone to a public library in the past year, whether or not someone else had gone to a library to obtain materials for the respondent, whether or not the respondent had called a library for information in the past year, and a constructed measure of any kind of use of a public library -

whether or not a respondent answered "yes" to any one of the three "use"questions. The results of these analyses indicated that there was only one statistically significant difference (See Tables 48 - 51). Respondents who did not go to a library in the last year rated the Independent Learning Center role higher than respondents who went to a library in the last year. This difference, however, was statistically trivial.

Respondents who indicated that they had gone to a library in the past year were also asked how many times they had gone to a library and were provided six numerical response categories which were converted into a six-point scale. This frequency of visit scale was also entered into correlation analyses with each of the role importance scales. The results of these analyses indicated that there was one statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficient with the Community Activities Center role ($r = -.17$). The less frequently the users went to a library, the higher their evaluations of the importance of the Community Activities Center role; the more frequently the users went to a library, the lower their evaluations of the importance of the Community Activities Center role.

These results indicate that, in general, users and nonusers of the public library tend to share the same evaluations of the importance of the various roles of the public library.

THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE'S OPINION ABOUT AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

The responses to the question about the amount of money that the community should spend on library services were tabulated and are reported in Table 52. These results indicate that 2.1% of the respondents answered that the community should spend nothing for library services, 35.4% answered that the community should spend between $1 to $20 or per capita on public libraries (this interval contains the national median of $16 per capita), while 51.6% of the respondents answered that the community should spend more than $20 per capita. Ten point eight per cent of the respondents were not sure and did not respond. The average per capita expenditure[7] that the respondents thought the community should spend annually on the public library was $39.86 - an amount twice as high as the national per capita expenditure.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION AMONG SEGMENTS OF THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

The respondents' opinions about the amount of public spending for library services were tested for differences among groups of respondents based on the same characteristics of the respondents that were identified on page 68. The results of these analyses, reported in Table 53, indicated that there were seven statistically significant and non-trivial differences. These differences were as follows:

---

[7] The average or mean of the scores was calculated using the mid-point of each interval; namely, $0, $10, $30, $50, $70, $90, and $110.

Region of country. Respondents living in the western states were of the opinion that the community should spend about $28.82 per capita which was lower than the amounts selected by respondents from the northeast states ($46.59) and the north central states ($47.64) and about the same as the amount selected by respondents from the south central states ($35.87).

% of community which is African American. Respondents living in communities with high percentages were of the opinion that the community should spend about $27.23 per capita which was lower than the amounts selected by respondents living in communities with low percentages ($42.74) and in communities with moderate percentages ($42.29).

Gender. Males were of the opinion that the community should spend about $45.96 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by female respondents ($35.05).

Marital status. Respondents who were widowed were of the opinion that the community should spend about $20.32 per capita which was lower than the amounts selected by respondents who were divorced ($55.27) or never married ($40.91), and respondents who were married were of the opinion that the community should spend about $36.42 per capita which was less than the amounts selected by respondents who were divorced ($55.27).

Number of people living in the home. Respondents living in homes with two people were of the opinion that the community should spend about $48.46 per capita which was higher than the amounts selected by respondents living in homes with one, four, and five or more people.

Whether the respondent voted in the last (1988) presidential election. Respondents who voted in the last presidential election were of the opinion that the community should spend about $43.39 per capita which was higher than the amounts selected by the non-voters ($34.03).

The respondent's opinion about his/her financial condition next year. Respondents who felt that they will be about as well off next as they were this year were of the opinion that the community should spend about $30.24 per capita which was lower than the amounts selected by respondents who felt that they will be better off next year ($43.91) and by respondents who felt that they will be worse off next year ($46.85).

The respondents' opinions about the amount of per capita public spending for library services were also entered into correlation analyses with the following quantitative characteristics of the respondents: age, highest grade level of education completed, the number of people living in the home, the number of preschool children living in the home, the number of students living in the home, and total household income. The results of these analyses indicated that there were no statistically significant relationships.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

The respondents' selection of the amount of public spending for library services was tested for differences among respondents (using analysis of variance) based on the following library use behaviors: whether or not the respondent had gone to a public library in the past year, whether or not someone else had gone to a library to obtain materials for the respondent, whether or not the respondent had called a library for information in the past year, and a constructed measure of any kind of use of a public library - whether or not a respondent answered "yes" to any one of the three "use"questions.

The results of these analyses, reported in Table 54, indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between users and nonusers of a library. The managerial significance of these results is that even nonusers of libraries feel that community should spend about twice the amount of the current national median level of financial support for public libraries.

Respondents who indicated that they had gone to a library in the past year were also asked how many times they had gone to a library and were provided six numerical response categories which were converted into a six-point scale. This frequency of visit scale was also entered into correlation analyses with each of the role importance scales. The result of this analysis indicated that there was a statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficient ($r = .19$) indicating that, among library users, the more frequently the users visited a library the higher the per capita support they thought the community should give to the library.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE ROLES AND THE OPINIONS ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

In order to identify which of the roles of the public library the public appeared most willing to support financially, each of the role importance scales was entered into a correlation analysis with the suggested amount of public spending scale. These analyses resulted in one statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficient. The respondents' evaluation of the importance of the Popular Materials Library role was positively related to the amount of money the respondents thought the community should provide ($r = .18$). The higher the respondents' ratings of the Popular Materials Library role, the greater the amount they thought the community should spend on the library; the lower the respondents' ratings of the Popular Materials Library role, the smaller the amount they thought the community should spend on the library. It appears that, for the African American community, all the other roles of the library, regardless of importance, were considered equally worthy of public financial support. However, the Popular Materials Library role, which was rated next to least important, appears not to be considered equally worthy of support.

TABLE 28
THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE VARIOUS ROLES OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY BY THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

(N = 401)

	$\bar{X}$	%
Formal Education Support Center	3.94	96.5
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.94	95.7
Independent Learning Center	3.89	93.1
Community Information Center	3.82	85.6
Research Center	3.79	84.6
Reference Library - Business	3.73	78.9
Reference Library - Personal	3.70	74.8
Public Work Place	3.65	70.7
Popular Materials Library	3.52	61.5
Community Activities Center	3.50	63.8

Note: N is the sample size and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. % represents the percentage of the sample that rated the role "very important." For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the % of respondents who rated the role "very important."

African American Sample

TABLE 29
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS FROM DIFFERENT REGIONS OF THE COUNTRY*

	Northeast (N = 82)		South Central (N = 206)		North Central (N = 77)		West (N = 35)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.96	97.3	3.92	95.2	3.97	97.4	4.00	100.0	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.97	97.4	3.93	95.1	3.96	96.8	3.93	93.2	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.70	74.6	3.66	71.8	3.77	80.9	3.72	79.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.80	83.8	3.66	73.3	3.82	86.3	3.84	83.8	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.66	76.3	3.43	59.5	3.41	58.8	3.65	70.0	n.s.	
Research Center	3.88	91.0	3.77	85.4	3.70	72.6	3.88	91.6	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.92	95.4	3.81	85.2	3.74	75.3	3.84	87.1	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.98	99.0	3.88	92.0	3.84	91.5	3.86	89.2	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.75	78.8	3.62	70.6	3.58	63.0	3.68	69.7	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.59	60.5	3.45	61.0	3.59	62.3	3.59	64.9	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 30
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS FROM COMMUNITIES WITH DIFFERENT PERCENTAGES OF AFRICAN AMERICAN RESIDENTS[*]

	26% - 100% (N = 216)		5% - 25% (N = 118)		0% - 4% (N = 66)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.95	96.0	3.98	98.9	3.87	93.5	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.94	94.5	3.98	99.1	3.89	93.7	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.64	70.6	3.84	84.4	3.63	71.1	.007	.026
Reference Library - Business	3.67	73.9	3.92	92.1	3.61	71.2	.000	.050
Community Activities Center	3.50	63.6	3.50	64.2	3.46	63.7	n.s.	
Research Center	3.75	83.8	3.82	84.1	3.87	91.5	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.87	89.7	3.82	83.3	3.68	76.0	.023	.020
Independent Learning Center	3.92	94.5	3.86	90.7	3.87	92.8	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.60	67.5	3.76	78.4	3.58	67.4	.042	.016
Popular Materials Library	3.51	61.4	3.64	70.8	3.33	45.2	.014	.022

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 31
COMPARISONS BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE RESPONDENTS*

	Male (N = 177)		Female (N = 224)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.93	95.7	3.95	97.1	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.94	95.0	3.95	96.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.65	71.9	3.73	77.1	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.73	78.3	3.74	79.3	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.55	66.1	3.46	61.9	n.s.	
Research Center	3.75	82.8	3.82	86.1	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.82	86.0	3.82	85.2	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.85	90.8	3.93	94.9	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.67	73.2	3.63	68.8	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.47	57.8	3.56	64.5	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 32
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS FROM DIFFERENT AGE GROUPS*

	18-35 (N = 177)		36-50 (N = 106)		51-65 (N = 47)		66 and up (N = 67)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.92	94.8	3.98	97.8	4.00	100.0	3.92	96.4	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.94	95.2	3.94	94.8	3.97	97.1	3.93	97.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.59	65.0	3.76	78.1	3.71	78.5	3.88	92.3	.003	.035
Reference Library - Business	3.68	75.6	3.71	75.0	3.84	83.9	3.84	89.2	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.43	56.7	3.50	67.4	3.42	63.5	3.70	76.1	n.s.	
Research Center	3.79	83.7	3.75	81.0	3.79	85.7	3.86	92.4	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.77	81.6	3.83	84.2	3.88	90.3	3.88	94.2	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.86	90.7	3.91	93.7	3.93	95.6	3.92	96.3	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.57	64.9	3.57	64.6	3.82	82.6	3.84	87.4	.002	.038
Popular Materials Library	3.50	61.0	3.55	60.2	3.61	68.9	3.45	59.7	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 33
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON HIGHEST GRADE LEVEL COMPLETED*

	8th grade or less (N = 71)		9th-11th grade (N = 59)		12th grade (N = 151)		Some college (N = 71)		Completed college (N = 46)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.94	97.1	3.86	93.1	3.99	98.7	3.97	97.1	3.89	92.0	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.95	98.4	3.98	98.2	3.94	94.9	3.92	94.5	3.93	93.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.83	87.4	3.73	76.4	3.79	81.9	3.53	59.3	3.43	53.3	.000	.057
Reference Library - Business	3.83	88.0	3.57	71.0	3.78	81.0	3.75	77.7	3.63	69.1	.041	.025
Community Activities Center	3.59	69.2	3.53	68.7	3.50	66.8	3.36	50.7	3.48	58.8	n.s.	
Research Center	3.87	92.3	3.85	90.9	3.80	83.7	3.67	73.1	3.73	86.0	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.85	91.0	3.84	89.6	3.86	87.6	3.80	81.0	3.66	72.3	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.91	96.3	4.00	100.0	3.95	96.7	3.73	83.2	3.82	83.2	.001	.033
Public Work Place	3.83	86.1	3.55	67.2	3.68	71.7	3.57	63.0	3.48	59.2	.011	.033
Popular Materials Library	3.50	63.0	3.55	70.0	3.60	67.0	3.34	43.7	3.51	57.1	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 34
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON AWARD OF HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA*

	High school diploma (N = 153)		No high school diploma (N = 129)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.99	98.7	3.90	95.3	.033	.016
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.94	94.9	3.97	98.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.74	77.0	3.84	88.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.75	80.2	3.74	81.3	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.51	65.8	3.55	70.1	n.s.	
Research Center	3.79	83.3	3.87	92.2	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.86	87.6	3.85	90.5	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.95	96.7	3.95	97.9	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.61	65.1	3.79	85.5	.012	.022
Popular Materials Library	3.62	69.5	3.50	63.1	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 35
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON MARITAL STATUS*

	Married (N = 164)		Widowed (N = 51)		Divorced (N = 70)		Never married (N = 114)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.96	97.6	4.00	100.0	3.98	98.8	3.87	91.8	.041	.021
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.94	96.3	4.00	100.0	3.95	96.0	3.91	92.7	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.67	72.6	3.90	90.4	3.71	76.0	3.64	70.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.68	75.1	3.86	87.5	3.84	84.7	3.69	76.6	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.55	68.5	3.66	69.0	3.63	72.0	3.25	49.5	.001	.043
Research Center	3.75	84.7	3.91	93.4	3.83	85.7	3.76	80.0	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.82	87.9	3.97	97.3	3.87	87.8	3.72	75.9	.013	.028
Independent Learning Center	3.90	93.1	3.97	96.9	3.84	91.8	3.88	92.1	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.64	69.9	3.87	87.3	3.85	87.6	3.44	53.9	.000	.078
Popular Materials Library	3.54	67.7	3.56	58.8	3.61	64.0	3.40	52.4	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 36
COMPARISON BETWEEN RESPONDENTS LIVING OR NOT LIVING WITH SPOUSE*

	Living with spouse (N = 141)		Not living with spouse (N = 23)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.96	97.6	3.95	97.6	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.93	96.0	3.95	98.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.67	72.6	3.68	72.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.68	74.9	3.71	76.2	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.54	67.3	3.63	75.8	n.s.	
Research Center	3.74	83.9	3.82	90.0	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.82	86.9	3.86	94.0	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.90	92.3	3.94	97.9	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.63	69.7	3.67	71.4	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.54	66.6	3.55	75.0	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 37
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN THE HOME*

	1 (N = 66)		2 (N = 111)		3 (N = 88)		4 (N = 67)		5 or more (N = 66)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.96	97.6	3.85	92.6	3.97	97.3	3.97	97.1	4.00	100.0	.018	.030
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.96	97.6	3.93	95.7	3.97	97.0	3.90	91.7	3.94	96.0	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.74	78.6	3.72	77.6	3.69	74.0	3.64	68.9	3.68	72.6	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.79	80.8	3.75	83.1	3.65	73.9	3.70	72.5	3.79	82.6	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.15	39.5	3.57	71.1	3.60	69.5	3.58	68.6	3.47	61.9	.002	.042
Research Center	3.64	69.5	3.76	84.1	3.86	91.5	3.81	84.7	3.86	90.8	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.76	76.8	3.79	86.4	3.86	89.0	3.85	87.5	3.88	87.5	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.87	93.1	3.83	91.7	3.93	93.8	3.89	89.4	3.97	98.0	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.63	68.6	3.69	78.0	3.56	62.7	3.59	62.6	3.76	79.1	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.45	52.9	3.39	55.0	3.60	64.2	3.55	64.0	3.65	74.0	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 38
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON NUMBER OF PRESCHOOLERS IN THE HOME[*]

	No preschoolers in the home (N = 231)		1 or more preschoolers in the home (N = 94)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.91	94.7	4.00	99.7	.043	.013
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.92	94.1	3.98	98.0	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.65	71.6	3.76	78.9	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.73	78.5	3.71	77.8	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.54	66.1	3.59	71.9	n.s.	
Research Center	3.79	86.0	3.89	91.5	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.82	87.0	3.87	87.9	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.90	93.8	3.89	90.9	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.61	68.6	3.73	75.0	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.47	59.4	3.65	70.7	.045	.012

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 39
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN THE HOME*

	No students in the home (N = 153)		1 or more students in the home (N = 177)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.90	94.7	3.97	97.5	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.93	95.5	3.94	95.1	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.70	74.9	3.68	73.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.71	79.9	3.74	77.5	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.57	70.1	3.55	66.6	n.s.	
Research Center	3.76	85.2	3.87	90.1	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.82	88.6	3.85	86.5	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.85	91.3	3.94	94.5	.030	.014
Public Work Place	3.62	69.4	3.67	72.2	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.43	56.0	3.61	69.3	.018	.017

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 40
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO ARE STUDENTS AND RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOT*

	Students (N = 47)		Non-students (N = 352)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.98	98.0	3.94	96.3	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.95	94.9	3.94	95.8	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.64	68.8	3.70	75.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.75	80.7	3.73	78.6	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.53	58.6	3.49	64.4	n.s.	
Research Center	3.83	87.6	3.78	84.2	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.81	81.3	3.82	86.1	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.85	85.5	3.90	94.1	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.73	74.2	3.64	70.2	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.56	64.2	3.51	61.0	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 41
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS WITH DIFFERENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS[*]

	Employed full time (N = 189)		Employed part time (N = 47)		Unemployed (N = 63)		Retired (N = 63)		Not in work force (N = 37)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.97	97.8	3.80	88.9	3.91	94.9	3.97	98.2	3.99	99.5	.015	.033
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.93	94.8	3.94	94.4	3.90	94.2	3.98	99.1	3.97	99.0	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.60	65.5	3.73	78.4	3.68	75.1	3.90	92.9	3.86	86.4	.003	.042
Reference Library - Business	3.73	77.0	3.65	71.9	3.70	78.7	3.85	89.6	3.70	78.7	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.35	53.2	3.62	66.2	3.59	78.3	3.62	71.9	3.71	76.8	.009	.035
Research Center	3.76	80.5	3.73	80.0	3.88	92.1	3.77	89.2	3.89	91.5	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.77	79.8	3.81	85.8	3.83	86.2	3.92	95.5	3.92	96.3	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.87	91.8	3.98	98.1	3.81	86.3	3.93	96.1	3.99	99.5	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.55	62.3	3.64	73.9	3.64	71.3	3.86	88.5	3.79	78.8	.006	.037
Popular Materials Library	3.47	56.7	3.54	63.1	3.62	72.7	3.44	56.3	3.63	72.4	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 42
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS WITH DIFFERENT ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME[*]

	Less than $10,000 (N = 107)		$10,000-$19,999 (N = 86)		$20,000-$29,999 (N = 62)		$30,000-$39,999 (N = 50)		$40,000 or more (N = 59)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.94	96.3	3.93	96.6	3.94	94.3	3.88	93.4	4.00	100.0	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.97	97.1	3.95	98.1	3.96	95.7	3.89	91.0	3.94	94.8	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.87	87.5	3.76	91.6	3.66	72.5	3.49	58.9	3.63	63.9	.001	.051
Reference Library - Business	3.78	81.1	3.67	76.1	3.68	78.2	3.76	80.9	3.73	75.7	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.75	82.0	3.34	55.4	3.49	63.5	3.29	48.1	3.49	58.2	.001	.050
Research Center	3.90	93.1	3.79	81.9	3.64	74.5	3.75	82.8	3.72	80.0	.053	.025
Community Information Center	3.91	93.5	3.79	81.8	3.78	83.1	3.71	76.9	3.81	82.9	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.96	97.3	3.88	92.8	3.79	88.1	3.86	90.2	3.90	91.3	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.78	82.1	3.64	69.0	3.64	71.9	3.60	66.6	3.52	56.7	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.55	62.8	3.55	63.0	3.53	59.2	3.40	57.4	3.51	58.6	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{x}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 43
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO LIVE IN HOUSEHOLDS WITH INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE DISABILITIES AND RESPONDENTS WHO DO NOT[*]

	Disabilities (N = 87)		No disabilities (N = 307)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.94	96.6	3.95	96.5	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.99	99.6	3.93	94.7	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.84	85.7	3.65	71.4	.008	.018
Reference Library - Business	3.76	81.2	3.73	78.2	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.70	78.6	3.44	59.6	.004	.021
Research Center	3.91	93.9	3.76	82.1	.022	.013
Community Information Center	3.85	89.1	3.82	84.6	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.97	98.5	3.88	91.6	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.73	76.2	3.62	68.8	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.55	60.6	3.51	61.4	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 44
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO ARE DISABLED AND RESPONDENTS LIVING IN A HOUSEHOLD WHERE SOMEONE ELSE IS DISABLED*

	Respondent (N = 23)		Someone Else (N = 60)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.96	96.7	3.93	96.4	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.95	98.4	4.00	100.0	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.71	73.2	3.89	89.7	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.68	67.7	3.77	85.1	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.63	69.3	3.72	81.1	n.s.	
Research Center	3.81	84.7	3.95	97.1	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.78	85.8	3.86	89.6	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.89	94.4	4.00	100.0	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.64	68.5	3.78	81.4	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.70	73.4	3.46	53.2	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 45
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO VOTED AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT VOTE IN THE 1988 ELECTION*

	Voted (N = 210)		Did not vote (N = 191)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.98	98.0	3.90	94.8	.024	.013
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.96	96.5	3.92	94.8	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.67	71.1	3.72	78.9	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.75	78.9	3.72	78.9	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.54	64.9	3.44	62.5	n.s.	
Research Center	3.81	87.7	3.77	81.4	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.88	89.6	3.76	81.2	.015	.015
Independent Learning Center	3.92	94.3	3.86	91.7	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.64	70.3	3.65	71.3	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.53	65.3	3.50	57.5	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 46
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON PERSONAL FINANCIAL SITUATION COMPARED TO LAST YEAR*

	Better off (N = 86)		Worse off (N = 137)		About the same (N = 176)		α	R^2
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%		
Formal Education Support Center	3.96	97.4	3.93	94.9	3.94	97.3	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.92	93.7	3.95	94.8	3.95	97.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.65	69.8	3.75	78.6	3.68	74.2	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.79	81.1	3.73	79.8	3.71	77.0	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.52	59.9	3.64	74.9	3.37	56.8	.008	.025
Research Center	3.79	84.9	3.88	91.0	3.71	79.4	.032	.018
Community Information Center	3.82	84.8	3.94	93.6	3.74	79.6	.001	.035
Independent Learning Center	3.92	93.4	3.93	95.6	3.85	91.0	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.56	64.5	3.67	73.1	3.67	71.9	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.57	64.9	3.62	70.7	3.41	52.5	.024	.019

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 47
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON PERSONAL FINANCIAL SITUATION EXPECTED FOR NEXT YEAR*

	Better off (N = 253)		Worse off (N = 20)		About the same (N = 106)		α	R^2
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%		
Formal Education Support Center	3.96	97.3	3.93	94.5	3.89	94.4	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.94	95.1	4.00	100.0	3.93	95.9	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.70	74.7	3.83	82.6	3.64	70.7	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.80	83.7	3.71	75.5	3.55	65.5	.001	.042
Community Activities Center	3.47	63.2	3.77	80.7	3.45	57.7	n.s.	
Research Center	3.78	83.0	3.87	91.0	3.80	86.9	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.80	82.9	3.96	95.7	3.81	87.2	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.90	93.4	3.92	92.5	3.87	91.3	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.67	71.5	3.57	72.8	3.57	65.1	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.56	64.4	3.54	66.9	3.41	51.5	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 48
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO VISITED AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT VISIT THE PUBLIC LIBRARY IN THE LAST YEAR*

	Visited library (N = 205)		Did not visit library (N = 196)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.94	95.8	3.95	97.2	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.93	94.4	3.96	97.1	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.66	70.4	3.74	79.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.74	79.9	3.73	77.7	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.52	65.0	3.47	62.5	n.s.	
Research Center	3.75	81.1	3.83	88.4	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.78	80.5	3.87	90.9	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.85	89.8	3.94	96.5	.034	.010
Public Work Place	3.60	66.8	3.70	74.9	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.57	64.2	3.46	58.6	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 49
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS BASED ON WHETHER SOMEONE ELSE WENT TO THE PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR THEM IN THE LAST YEAR*

	Yes (N = 54)		No (N = 344)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.93	93.4	3.94	96.9	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.88	90.5	3.95	96.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.78	82.3	3.68	73.6	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.72	78.6	3.74	78.9	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.53	66.7	3.50	63.6	n.s.	
Research Center	3.89	93.8	3.77	83.1	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.88	91.6	3.81	84.5	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.95	96.6	3.89	92.6	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.69	72.1	3.64	70.5	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.58	64.7	3.50	60.8	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 50
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO CALLED THE PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR INFORMATION IN THE LAST YEAR AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT*

	Called library (N = 63)		Did not call library (N = 337)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.92	94.6	3.95	96.8	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.93	94.3	3.94	96.0	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.60	61.9	3.72	77.2	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.69	72.0	3.74	80.2	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.47	55.0	3.50	65.5	n.s.	
Research Center	3.82	86.7	3.78	84.3	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.77	77.7	3.83	87.0	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.90	90.1	3.89	93.7	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.56	59.8	3.66	72.8	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.52	57.6	3.52	62.3	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 51
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO IN ANY WAY USED THE PUBLIC LIBRARY IN THE LAST YEAR AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT[*]

	Users (N = 217)		Non-users (N = 183)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.94	96.0	3.94	97.1	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.92	94.2	3.96	97.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.67	71.6	3.73	78.7	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.75	80.2	3.72	77.3	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.52	64.8	3.47	62.5	n.s.	
Research Center	3.76	82.1	3.82	87.8	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.79	81.4	3.86	90.5	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.86	90.1	3.94	96.7	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.61	67.4	3.70	74.8	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.57	63.9	3.46	58.7	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 52
AFRICAN AMERICANS' OPINIONS ABOUT LEVELS OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOP LIBRARY SERVICES

Amount	Frequency	Percent	Adjusted Percent*
$ 0	9	2.1	2.4
$ 1 - $20	142	35.4	39.7
$21 - $40	92	23.0	25.8
$41 - $60	21	5.3	5.9
$61 - $80	12	2.9	3.3
$81 - $100	41	10.1	11.4
$101 -	41	10.3	11.6
Don't Know	43	10.8	Missing
Total	401		

---

* Note: Percentages recalculated with missing respondents excluded.

TABLE 53
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

	N	$\bar{X}$	C.I.
Entire Sample	357	$39.90	$36.13 - $43.67

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Region of country			.009	.033	
Northeast	80	$46.59			$38.66 - $54.53
South Central	171	$35.87			$30.34 - $41.39
North Central	70	$47.64			$37.82 - $57.45
West	35	$28.82			$25.14 - $32.50
% of community which is African American			.009	.027	
Over 25%	193	$42.74			$37.42 - $48.07
5% - 25%	101	$42.29			$35.29 - $49.29
Less than 5%	62	$27.23			$19.57 - $34.90
Gender			.004	.023	
Males	159	$45.96			$40.02 - $51.90
Females	198	$35.05			$30.34 - $39.76
Age			n.s.	--	
18 - 35	172	$39.65			$34.36 - $44.94
36 - 50	93	$39.52			$32.07 - $46.98
51 - 65	36	$41.74			$29.25 - $54.24
66 and up	51	$38.68			$27.71 - $49.64

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 53 (continued)
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Highest grade level completed			n.s.	--	
8th grade or less	55	$40.04			$29.39 - $50.70
9th - 11th grade	51	$38.02			$28.05 - $47.98
12th grade	134	$35.48			$29.68 - $41.27
Some college	68	$44.34			$34.95 - $53.72
Completed college	43	$46.63			$36.83 - $56.43
High school diploma or equivalent			n.s.	--	
Yes	143	$38.80			$33.01 - $44.59
No	99	$34.58			$27.47 - $41.69
Marital status			.000	.072	
Married	144	$36.42			$31.00 - $41.85
Widowed	34	$20.32			$12.46 - $28.17
Divorced	66	$55.27			$45.67 - $64.87
Never married	110	$40.91			$33.75 - $48.06
# of people living in the home			.014	.035	
one	51	$31.36			$21.35 - $41.36
two	98	$48.46			$40.44 - $56.48
three	77	$43.56			$35.46 - $51.66
four	66	$36.10			$28.44 - $43.76
five or more	61	$32.56			$24.31 - $40.81

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 53 (continued)
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
# of preschool children in the home			n.s.	--	
No preschoolers	205	\$43.09			\$38.06 - \$48.13
One or more preschoolers	91	\$39.58			\$32.42 - \$46.73
# of students in the home			n.s.	--	
No students	140	\$45.27			\$38.77 - \$51.77
One or more students	162	\$37.93			\$32.78 - \$43.08
Respondents who are students			n.s.	--	
Students	46	\$38.54			\$29.88 - \$47.20
Non-students	310	\$39.93			\$35.82 - \$44.04
Employment status			n.s.	--	
Employed full time	173	\$40.90			\$35.74 - \$46.06
Employed part time	44	\$50.31			\$38.69 - \$61.93
Unemployed	61	\$35.93			\$27.70 - \$44.15
Retired	42	\$28.71			\$17.45 - \$39.96
Not in work force	33	\$40.26			\$24.73 - \$55.79
Annual household income			n.s.	--	
Less than \$9,999	87	\$36.42			\$28.02 - \$44.81
\$10,000 - \$19,999	76	\$35.37			\$27.52 - \$43.22
\$20,000 - \$29,999	61	\$39.70			\$30.41 - \$48.99
\$30,000 - \$39,999	46	\$42.11			\$33.09 - \$51.13
\$40,000 or more	54	\$47.39			\$37.67 - \$57.10

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 53 (continued)
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Disabled person in household			n.s.	--	
Yes	72	$43.23			$34.44 - $52.02
No	280	$38.20			$34.07 - $42.33
Respondent disabled			n.s.	--	
Yes	20	$40.95			$22.58 - $59.31
No	48	$45.92			$35.03 - $56.80
Voted in '88 election			.003	.025	
Yes	185	$45.39			$40.19 - $50.59
No	172	$34.03			$28.73 - $39.33
Current financial situation			n.s.	--	
Better off than last year	83	$40.51			$33.30 - $47.71
Worse off than last year	121	$41.33			$35.07 - $47.60
About the same	150	$38.04			$31.82 - $44.26
Future financial situation			.010	.028	
Better off next year	236	$43.91			$39.18 - $48.64
Worse off next year	17	$46.85			$27.47 - $66.23
About the same	84	$30.24			$22.94 - $37.54

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 54
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES BETWEEN LIBRARY USERS AND NON-USERS[*]

	N	$\bar{X}$	C.I.
Entire Sample	357	\$39.90	\$36.13 - \$43.67

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Respondent went to public library last year			n.s.	--	
Yes	199	\$41.29			\$36.35 - \$46.23
No	158	\$38.16			\$32.40 - \$43.92
Someone else went to library for respondent			n.s.	--	
Yes	52	\$39.94			\$30.64 - \$49.24
No	304	\$39.71			\$31.65 - \$47.78
Respondent called library for information			n.s.	--	
Yes	62	\$44.19			\$35.92 - \$52.46
No	296	\$39.01			\$34.82 - \$43.20
Respondent used library in any way last year			n.s.	--	
Yes	211	\$40.27			\$35.51 - \$45.03
No	147	\$39.36			\$33.28 - \$45.44

---

[*] Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents by library use.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 68. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

PART III. THE SURVEY OF CAUCASIAN AMERICANS

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

The Caucasian American sample included 846 respondents. The data from this sample were weighted to ensure that the demographic characteristics of the weighted sample conformed to the latest available Census Bureau estimates of the characteristics of the national Caucasian American population for age, gender, race, formal education attainment, and region of country. The demographic characteristics of the sample are as follows:[1]

Region of country[2]	22.5% northeast
	31.2% south central
	26.0% north central
	20.3% west
Size of community[3]	5.3% over 1,000,000
	10.4% 250,000 - 1,000,000
	84.2% under 250,000
Gender	47.3% male
	52.7% female

---

[1] The frequency distributions for the responses to all the questions in the interview are presented in the Appendix for this report. The Appendix is a separately bound publication.

[2] These regional areas are defined by The Gallup Organization as follows: northeastern states = Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont; south central states = Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Washington D.C., Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia; north central states = Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin; western states = Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

[3] The Gallup Organization defined size of community as follows: incorporated cities with populations of 1,000,000 or more; incorporated cities with populations of 250,000 to 1,000,000; and incorporated cities or unincorporated communities with populations less than 250,000.

Age	35.6%	18 - 35 years
	26.5%	36 - 50 years
	18.8%	51 - 65 years
	18.4%	66 years and older
	.9%	missing
Grade level completed	6.9%	8th grade or less
	10.7%	9th - 11th grade
	38.8%	12th grade
	17.2%	some college
	3.9%	associate degree
	15.1%	bachelor's degree
	4.2%	master's degree
	3.1%	professional/doctoral
	.1%	missing
High school diploma or equivalent	40.9%	yes
	15.4%	no
	43.7%	missing
Marital status	61.2%	married
	11.0%	widowed
	10.2%	divorced
	17.4%	never married
	.2%	missing
Living with spouse	59.4%	yes
	1.7%	no
	38.9%	missing
# of people living at home	17.5%	one
	34.7%	two
	17.5%	three
	17.9%	four
	8.2%	five
	3.3%	six or more
	1.0%	missing
# of preschool children in home	63.4%	zero
	10.2%	one
	6.6%	two
	.6%	three
	.5%	four
	18.7%	missing

# of school children in home	45.4%	zero
	18.7%	one
	12.4%	two
	3.1%	three
	1.7%	four or more
	18.7%	missing
Respondents who were students	1.0%	high school
	1.2%	non-academic program
	5.2%	college students
	1.8%	graduate students
	90.9%	missing
Primary language spoken at home	99.2%	English
	.8%	missing
Employment status	50.9%	employed full-time
	12.1%	employed part-time
	6.5%	unemployed
	21.9%	retired
	8.0%	not in work force
	.6%	missing
Household income	1.6%	less than $5,000
	4.6%	$ 5,000 - $ 9,999
	6.9%	$10,000 - $14,999
	7.1%	$15,000 - $19,999
	8.1%	$20,000 - $24,999
	10.9%	$25,000 - $29,999
	8.5%	$30,000 - $34,999
(Median)	8.7%	$35,000 - $39,999
	5.8%	$40,000 - $44,999
	5.1%	$45,000 - $49,999
	4.0%	$50,000 - $54,999
	2.3%	$55,000 - $59,999
	2.3%	$60,000 - $64,999
	1.1%	$65,000 - $69,999
	1.4%	$70,000 - $74,999
	7.4%	$75,000 or more
	14.2%	missing
Disabled person in household	14.1%	yes
	84.2%	no
	1.7%	missing

Respondent disabled	7.6%	yes
	5.4%	someone else
	86.9%	missing
Nature of disability	1.0%	sight
	5.0%	mobility
	91.0%	missing
Voted in '88 election	65.3%	yes
	33.9%	no
	.7%	missing
Current financial situation	24.6%	better off than last year
	22.9%	worse off than last year
	58.1%	about the same
	.7%	missing
Future financial situation	42.6%	better off next year
	7.7%	worse off next year
	45.5%	about the same
	4.3%	missing.

LIBRARY USE AMONG THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

The data indicated that 57.7% of the Caucasian sample had personally gone to a public library in the past year, 23.3% of the sample reported that someone else had obtained materials for them, and 23.6% of the sample had called a library for information. Controlling for overlap among these activities, it was determined that 64.7% of the sample had in some way used a public library in the last year while 35.3% of the sample reported no use of a library.

EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

The responses to the role evaluation questions were analyzed in two ways: first, mean scores for the role importance scales were calculated; and second, the percentages of respondents who for each role selected the category "very important" were tabulated. While the mean importance scale score yields a more precise estimate of the respondents' evaluations of the importance of a role, the percentage of respondents who selected the category "very important" is the more easily understood and communicated estimate of the importance of a role. All of the tables presenting results of role evaluations present both the mean scale scores and the percentage "scores."

The results of the role evaluations are reported in Table 55 in ranked order from the role receiving the highest mean importance scale score to the role receiving the lowest mean importance scale score. These results can be interpreted in two ways: first, the scores for any given role can be interpreted in terms of their position or standing on the four-point importance scale (an absolute assessment); and second, the scores for any given role can be interpreted in terms of their ranking relative to the scores received by the other roles (a relative assessment). For example, more than half of the sample (52.3%) rated the Popular Materials Library role as "very important" with a mean score of 3.37, but this rating places the role in eighth position of importance compared to the mean scores received by the other roles. The reader should note that the ranking by mean score is not the same as the ranking by the percentage "score." The reader should also note that the distance between the mean scores for some of the roles is quite small indicating that, while one role is ranked higher or lower than another role, for all practical purposes the roles are about equal in importance. The same observation could also be made for the percentage "scores."

The results in Table 55 indicate that a majority of the Caucasian American sample considered eight out of the ten roles to be "very important." Of these, however, the Formal Education Support Center role, the Independent Learning Center role, and the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role were rated as the most important roles of the public library in the community. These results indicate that the Caucasian American respondents considered the public library's roles to support the educational aspirations of the community its most important roles.

In evaluating these results the reader should also keep in mind some of the anomalies in the role statements and the public's interpretations of the role statements that were discussed on pages 17-19.

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY DIFFERENT SEGMENTS OF THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

The respondents' opinions about the importance of each role were tested for differences between or among groups of respondents using analysis of variance.[4] The different groups of

---

[4] Analysis of variance is a statistical procedure for testing whether the observed differences among group means for each role evaluation occurred by chance or because the groups differed in their evaluations of the importance of the role. A statistically significant difference among the group means is defined as one whose probability of occurring by chance (the α level reported in the tables) is so low that we choose to conclude that the difference did not occur by chance but that it occurred because the groups differed in their evaluation of the role. All differences with an α level of .05 or less (that is, the probability that the difference occurred by chance is 5 out of a hundred or less) are considered to be statistically significant. The α levels for all statistically significant differences are reported in the tables. All differences with an α level greater than .05 (that is, the probability that the difference occurred by chance is greater than 5 out of a hundred) are considered to be non-significant and are designated as such in the table with the initials n.s.

A non-trivial difference is defined as a statistically significant difference whose magnitude of difference is sufficiently large that it warrants attention for possible usefulness in managerial decision making. By contrast, a trivial difference is defined as a statistically significant difference whose magnitude of difference is so small or trivial as to be of questionable value in managerial decision making. Deciding whether a statistically significant difference is trivial or non-trivial is a judgement call. We have adopted the rule that if R^2, the coefficient of determination, is equal to or greater than .02 the difference is considered to be non-trivial. The coefficient of determination measures the amount of variation in the role evaluation scores that is explained by the group differences - the larger the coefficient of determination, the more meaningful the difference. The coefficients of determination for all respondents were identified by, or created from, the following characteristics: the region of the country where the respondent lived; the size of the community in which the respondent lived; the gender of the respondent; the age of the respondent; the highest grade level of education completed by the respondent and, if the 12th grade or less, whether the respondent had a high school diploma; whether, if the respondent had an associate degree, the respondent graduated from an academic program or an occupational program; the respondent's current marital status and, if married, whether the respondent was currently living with a spouse; the number of people living in the respondent's home; the number of preschool children living in the home; the number of students living in the home; whether the respondent was currently a student and, if so, the nature of the program of study; the primary language spoken at home; the respondent's current employment status; total annual household income; whether anyone in the household was disabled; whether the respondent was disabled and, if so, the nature of the disability; whether the respondent voted in the last (i.e., 1988) presidential election; the respondent's opinion about his or her current financial situation; the respondent's opinion about his or her financial situation next year; whether the respondent personally went to a public library in the past year and, if so, how many times; whether anyone else went to a library for the respondent; whether the respondent called a library for information in the past year; and whether the respondent made any use of a library in the past year.

In the preceding analyses, the quantitative characteristics of the respondents (age, highest grade level of education completed, the number of people living in the home, the number of preschool children living in the home, the number of students living in the home, and total annual household income) were grouped into intervals (e.g., respondents 18 to 35 years old, respondents 36 to 50 years old, etc.) and the mean role importance scale scores for these groups were compared for differences using analysis of variance. This was done in order to facilitate comparisons to local data which oftentimes are available only in this grouped format. Another way of analyzing whether any of these characteristics of the respondents is related to the respondents' evaluations of the importance of the roles is by means of correlation analysis[5] which tests for the presence of a trend between the characteristic and the role importance score. For example, as the age of the respondents increases does their evaluation of the importance of a role tend to increase or decrease? In order to determine if trends such as this exist, each of

---

statistically significant differences are reported in the tables so assessments about triviality can be made.

[5] A correlation coefficient is an index of the strength of the relationship between two quantitative variables. The coefficient can take a value from -1.00 (indicating a perfect inverse relationship) to 0.00 (indicating the absence of any relationship) to +1.00 (indicating a perfect positive relationship). Typically, correlation coefficients appear either as a negative decimal value (indicating that high scores for one variable are associated with low scores for the other variable) or as a positive decimal value (indicating that high scores for one variable are associated with high scores for the other variable). The higher the decimal value, the stronger the relationship.

A statistically significant relationship is defined as one whose probability of occurrence by chance is so low that we choose to conclude that it did not occur by chance but that it occurred because the two variables are related. A non-trivial relationship is defined as a statistically significant relationship of sufficient strength that it warrants attention for possible usefulness in managerial decision making. In this report, correlation coefficients equal to or greater than ±.15 are considered to be non-trivial.

these quantitative characteristics of the respondents was also entered into a correlation analysis with each of the role importance scales.

While the results of the analyses of variance with the grouped data and the results of the correlation analyses with the ungrouped data are complementary, it should be noted that the correlation analyses are not always sensitive to a difference between two or more groups which might exist. Consequently, the results of the two tests sometimes do not agree. The results of both sets of analyses are reported below.

Region of the country. There were no statistically significant differences in the role evaluations by respondents living in the four regions of the country (see Table 56).

Size of community. There were no statistically significant differences in the role evaluations by respondents living in communities of different size populations (see Table 57).

Gender. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for male and female respondents indicated that there were five statistically significant and non-trivial differences and four statistically significant but trivial differences. Of particular note, however, was the pattern of these differences between males and females. The female respondents rated all roles (with the exception of the Reference Library for personal information role) higher than did the male respondents (see Table 58). Interestingly, there was little difference between males and females in the relative rank orders of the role scores (the correlation coefficient between the two sets of mean scores was .97). In effect, females considered each of the roles of the library to be more important than did the males, but both groups tended to agree about which roles were more important relative to other roles.

Age of the respondent. There were no statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between the age of the respondents and their evaluations of the importance of the roles.

The respondents were also divided into four age groups: 18 - 35 years old; 36 - 50 years old; 51 - 65 years old; and over 65 years old. Comparisons of the mean importance scale sores for these four groups indicated that there were three statistically significant, but trivial, differences among the groups (see Table 59). Respondents who were 18 to 35 years old rated the Independent Learning Center higher than respondents who were 51 - 65 years old. Respondents who were 51 - 65 years old and respondents who were over 65 years old rated the Public Work Place role higher than respondents who were 18 - 35 years old and respondents who were 36 - 50 years old. Respondents who were 51 - 65 years old and respondents who were over 65 years old rated the Popular Materials Library role higher than respondents who were 18 - 35 years old.

Highest grade level completed. There was one statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficient. The highest grade level completed by the respondents was inversely correlated (r = -.15) with the respondents' rating of the importance of the Public Work Place role. The lower the grade level completed, the higher the rating of the importance of the Public Work Place role; the higher the grade level completed, the lower the rating of the importance of the Public Work Place role.

The respondents were divided into five groups based on the number of grades completed: 8th grade or less, 9th - 11th grades, 12th grade, some college, and college graduates. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for these five groups indicated that there were seven statistically significant differences among the groups (see Table 60). Respondents who had completed 9th - 11th grades rated the Formal Education Support role lower than all other groups. Respondents who had completed the 8th grade or less rated the Reference Library for personal information role higher than all other groups. Respondents who had completed the 8th grade or less rated the Research Center role higher than all other groups. Respondents who had graduated from college rated the Community Information Center role lower than respondents who had completed the 12th grade, 9th - 11th grades, or the 8th grade or less. Respondents who had graduated from college and respondents who had completed some college rated the Public Work Place role lower than all other groups. The differences for the Formal Education Support role, the Reference Library for personal information role, the Community Information Center Role, and the Public Work Place role were non-trivial. The differences for the Reference Library for business role, the Research Center role, and the Independent Learning Center role were trivial.

Whether, if the respondent had completed the 12th grade or less, the respondent had a high school diploma or equivalent. There were two statistically significant, but trivial, differences between these two groups. Respondents who had a high school diploma rated the Reference Library for personal information role and the Public Work Place role lower than respondents who did not (see Table 61).

Whether, if the respondent had an associate degree, the respondent graduated from an academic program or an occupational program. There were too few responses to this question to permit group comparisons.

Marital status. There were five statistically significant, but trivial, differences in the role evaluations by different marital status groups (see Table 62). Respondents who were never married rated the Formal Education Support Center role lower than all other groups. There then appears to be a pattern of differences between respondents who were widowed and the other groups. Respondents who were widowed rated the Community Activities Center role higher than respondents who were never married and respondents who were married, the Community Information Center role higher than respondents who were never married and respondents who were married; the Public Work Place role higher than all other respondents; and the Popular Materials Library role higher than all other respondents.

Whether a married respondent was currently living with a spouse. The number of married respondents currently not living with a spouse was too small to permit meaningful comparisons.

The number of people living in the home. There were no statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between the number of people living at home and the respondents' evaluations of the importance of the roles.

Based on the number of people living in the home, the respondents were divided into five groups: respondents living in homes with one person, two people, three people, four people, and five or more people. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for these five groups indicated that there were three statistically significant differences among the groups (see Table

63). Respondents living in homes with two people rated the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role lower than respondents living in homes with one or four people. Respondents living in homes with two people rated the Community Information Center role lower than respondents living in homes with one, four, or five or more people; and respondents living in homes with three people rated this role lower than respondents living in homes with one person. Respondents living in homes with one person and respondents living in homes with five or more people rated the Public Work Place role higher than respondents living in homes with two, three, or four people. The difference for the Public Place role was non-trivial. The differences for the Formal Education Support Center role and the Community Information Center role were trivial.

The number of preschool children living in the home. There were no statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between the number of preschool children living at home and the respondents' evaluations of the importance of the roles.

Because of the low number of multiple preschool children in the home, the respondents were divided into two groups: respondents living in homes without any preschoolers and respondents in homes with one or more preschoolers. Comparisons between the groups indicated that there were two statistically significant differences (see Table 64). Respondents who had preschoolers in the home rated the Community Information Center role and the Independent Learning Center role higher than respondents who did not have preschoolers in the home. The difference with the Independent Learning Center role was trivial.

The number of students living in the home. There were no statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between the number of children living at home and the respondents' evaluations of the roles.

Because of the low number of multiple students living in the home, the respondents were divided into two groups: respondents living in homes without any students and respondents in homes with one or more students. Comparisons between the groups indicated that there were two statistically significant, but trivial, differences (see Table 65). Respondents living in homes with one or more students rated the Formal Education Support Center role and the Public Work Place role higher than respondents living in homes without any students.

Whether the respondent was currently a student. There were no statistically significant differences in the evaluations of the importance of the roles by respondents who were in school or in a training program and respondents who were not.(see Table 66).

Nature of the program of study. Dividing the respondents into groups based on the nature of their program of study produced groups too small for comparisons.

Employment status. There were two statistically significant differences among the groups of respondents with different employment status (see Table 67). Respondents who were not in the work force rated the Reference Library for business role higher than all other groups; respondents who were unemployed rated this role lower than respondents who were employed full time and respondents who were employed part time; and respondents who were retired rated this role lower than respondents who were employed part time. Respondents who were employed full time rated the Public Work Place role lower than respondents who were employed part time, respondents who were retired, and respondents who were not in the work force. The difference among the groups for the Reference Library for business role was non-trivial. The difference in the Public Work Place roles was trivial.

Total annual household income. There was one statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficient. Total household income was inversely correlated (r = -.19) with the evaluation of the importance of the library's role as a Public Work Place. The lower the household income the higher the evaluation of the importance of the Public Work Place role; the higher the household income the lower the evaluation of the importance of the Public Work Place role.

Based on the amount of total household income, the respondents were divided into five groups: households with incomes of less than $15,000, $15,000 to $29,999, $30,000 to $44,999, $45,000 to $59,999, and $60,000 or more. Comparisons of the mean role importance scale scores for respondents based on their total household income level indicated that there were six statistically significant differences among the groups (see Table 68). Respondents who lived in households with incomes less than $15,000 and respondents who lived in households with incomes of $60,000 or more rated the Formal Education Support Center role lower than respondents who lived in households with incomes of $30,000 to $44,999, and with incomes of $45,000 to $59,999. Respondents who lived in households with incomes of $60,000 or more rated the Preschoolers' Door to Learning Role lower than respondents who lived in households with incomes of $15,000 or less, $15,000 to $29,999, and $30,000 to $44,999. Respondents who lived in households with incomes of less than $15,000 rated the Research Center role, the Community Information Center role, and the Public Work Place role higher than all the other groups and these respondents also rated the Independent Learning Center role higher than all other groups with the exception of the those respondents living in households with incomes between $15,000 and $29,999. In addition, respondents who lived in households with incomes of more than $60,000 rated the Community Information Center role lower than respondents living in households with incomes of $30,000 to $44,999, rated the Independent Learning Center role lower than respondents living in households with incomes of $15,000 to $29,999, and $30,000 to $44,999, and rated the Public Work Place role lower than respondents living in households with incomes of $15,000 to $29,999.

The differences among the groups for the Formal Education Support Center role, the Preschoolers' Door to Learning Role, and the Research Center role were trivial. The differences among the groups for the Community Information Center role, the Independent Learning Center role, and the Public Work Place role were non-trivial.

Whether anyone in the household was disabled. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for respondents living in households with a disabled person and respondents living in households without a disabled person indicated that there was one statistically significant, but trivial, difference between the groups (see Table 69). Respondents living in a household with a disable person rated the Public Work Place role higher than respondents living in a household without a disabled person.

Whether the respondent was disabled. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for respondents who were disabled and respondents living in households with someone else disabled indicated that there were four statistically significant and non-trivial differences between the groups (see Table 70). Respondents who were disabled rated the Reference Library for business role, the Research Center role, the Public Work Place role, and the Popular Materials Library role higher than the respondents who were not disabled.

The nature of the disability. Dividing the disabled respondents into groups based on the nature of their disability produced groups too small for comparisons.

Whether the respondent voted in the last (1988) presidential election. Comparisons of the mean role importance scale scores of respondents who voted and respondents who did not vote in the 1988 election indicated that there were four statistically significant, but trivial, differences between the groups (see Table 71). Respondents who voted rated the Formal Education Support Center role and the Popular Materials Library role higher than respondents who did not vote. Respondents who did not vote rated the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role and the Independent Learning Center role higher than respondents who did vote.

The respondent's opinion about his/her current financial condition. Comparisons of the mean role importance scale scores for respondents based on their opinions about their current financial condition indicated that there was one statistically significant, but trivial, difference among the groups (see Table 72). Respondents who felt that their current financial condition was better than last year rated the Research Center role lower than the other respondents who felt that their current financial condition was either worse than last year or about the same as last year.

The respondents's opinion about his/her financial condition next year. Comparisons of the mean role importance scale scores for respondents based on their opinions about their financial condition next year indicated that there were four statistically significant, but trivial, differences among the groups (see Table 73). Respondents who felt that their financial condition next year will be worse than this year rated the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role lower than respondents who felt that their financial condition next year will be either better off or about the same as this year. Respondents who felt that their financial condition next year will be better than this year rated the Community Activities Center role lower than respondents who felt that their financial condition next year will be about the same as this year. Respondents who felt that their financial condition next year will be worse than this year rated the Research Center role lower than respondents who felt that their financial condition next year will be about the same. Respondents who felt that their financial condition next year will be better than this year rated the Popular Materials Library role lower than respondents who felt that their financial condition next year will be about the same as this year.

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

Each of the role importance scales was tested for differences among respondents (using analysis of variance) based on the following library use behaviors: whether or not the respondent had gone to a public library in the past year, whether or not someone else had gone to a library to obtain materials for the respondent, whether or not the respondent had called a library for information in the past year, and a constructed measure of any kind of use of a public library -

whether or not a respondent answered "yes" to any one of the three "use" questions. The results of these analyses are reported below.

Whether the respondent had gone to a public library in the past year. There were three statistically significant, but trivial, differences between respondents who had gone and respondents who had not gone to a public library in the past year (see Table 74). Respondents who had gone to a library rated the Formal Education Support Center role, the Reference Library for personal information role, and the Popular Materials Library role higher than respondents who had not gone to a library.

Respondents who indicated that they had gone to a library in the past year were also asked how many times they had gone to a library and were provided six numerical response categories which were converted into a six-point scale. This frequency of visit scale was also entered into correlation analyses with each of the role importance scales. The results of these analyses indicated that there was one statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficient. The users' frequency of visiting a library was correlated ($r = .19$) with their evaluation of the importance of the Popular Materials Library role. The more frequently the users went to a library the higher their evaluation of the importance of the Popular Materials Library role.

Whether someone else went to a public library for the respondent. There was one statistically significant, but trivial, difference between respondents who had someone else go to a library for them and respondents who did not (see Table 75). Respondents who had someone else go to a library for them rated the Formal Education Support Center role higher than respondents who did not.

Whether the respondent called a public library in the last year. There were two statistically significant, but trivial, differences between respondents who called a library for information and those that did not (see Table 76). Respondents who had called a library rated the Formal Education Support Center role and the Reference Library for personal information role higher than respondents who had not called a library for information.

Whether the respondent had made any use of a public library in the past year. There were two statistically significant, but trivial, differences between respondents who had made any use of a library and respondents who had not (see Table 77). Respondents who had made any use of a library rated the Formal Education Support Center role and the Reference Library for personal information role higher than respondents who had not made any use of a library.

THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE'S OPINION ABOUT AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

The responses to the question about the amount of money that the community should spend on library services were tabulated and are reported in Table 78. These results indicate that about 34.5% of the respondents answered that the community should spend between $1 to $20 per capita on public libraries (this interval contains the national [1990] median of $16.00 per capita) while 52.6% of the respondents answered that the community should spend more than $20 per capita. Twelve point nine per cent of the respondents were not sure and did not respond. The average per capita expenditure[6] that the respondents thought the community should spend annually on the public library was $33.73 - an amount twice as high as the national per capita expenditure.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION AMONG SEGMENTS OF THE CAUCASIAN SAMPLE ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

The respondents' opinions about the amount of public financial support for library services was tested for differences among respondents based on the same characteristics of the respondents as were identified on pages 111 and 112. The results of these analyses, reported in Table 79, indicated that there were only four statistically significant differences of which only one was non-trivial. These differences are reported below.

Region of country. Respondents living in the northeastern states were of the opinion that the community should spend about $41.61 per capita which was higher than the amounts selected by respondents living in the north central states ($30.57), the south central states ($30.51), and the western states ($33.33). This difference was non-trivial.

Size of community. Respondents living in communities with populations over 1,000,000 were of the opinion that the community should spend about $44.35 per capita which was higher than the amounts selected by respondents living in communities with populations between 250,000 and 1,000,000 ($33.80) and communities with populations under 250,000 ($32.95). This difference was trivial.

Whether, if the respondent had completed 12th grade or less, the respondent had a high school diploma. Respondents who did not have a high school diploma were of the opinion that the community should spend about $37.25 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by respondents with a high school diploma ($29.31). This difference was trivial.

Whether the respondent was a student. Respondents who were students were of the opinion that the community should spend about $39.75 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by respondents who were not students ($32.91). This difference was trivial.

There were no statistically significant differences among the respondents based on gender, age, highest grade level completed, marital status, the number of people living in the home, whether there were any preschoolers in the home, whether there were any students in the home, employment status, total annual household income, whether there were any disabled persons in the household, whether the respondent was disabled, whether the respondent voted in the 1988 election, the respondent's financial condition this year, and the respondent's financial condition next year.

---

[6] The average or mean of the scores was calculated using the mid-point of each interval; namely, $0, $10, $30, $50, $70, $90, and $110.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

The respondents' selection of the amount of money the community should spend for library services was tested for differences among respondents (using analysis of variance) based on the following library use behaviors: whether or not the respondent had gone to a public library in the past year, whether or not someone else had gone to a library to obtain materials for the respondent, whether or not the respondent had called a library for information in the past year, and a constructed measure of any kind of use of a public library - whether or not a respondent answered "yes" to any one of the three "use"questions. The results of these analyses, reported in Table 80, indicated that there were two statistically significant, but trivial, differences.

Respondents who had gone to a public library last year were of the opinion that the community should spend about $35.35 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by respondents who had not gone to a public library ($31.23).

Those respondents who indicated that they had gone to a library in the past year were also asked how frequently they had gone to a library. This frequency of visit scale was also entered into correlation analysis with the suggested amount of community spending scale. The result of this analysis indicated that there was a statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficient ($r = .19$) indicating that, among library users, the more frequently they visited a library, the more money they thought the community should spend for library services.

Respondents who called a library for information were of the opinion that the community should spend about $38.07 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by respondents who had not called a library ($32.18).

The trivial nature of these differences indicates that while users of libraries feel that libraries should get a higher amount of per capita support than nonusers, the differences are not that great. The managerial significance of these data is that even nonusers of libraries feel that libraries should get about twice the amount of the current national median level of financial support.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE ROLES AND THE OPINIONS ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

In order to identify which of the roles of the public library the Caucasian American sample appeared most willing to support financially, each of the role importance scales was entered into a correlation analysis with the suggested amount of community spending scale. None of these analyses resulted in a correlation coefficient that was statistically significant and non-trivial. These results suggest that the amount of community spending for library services the Caucasian Americans are willing to support is not related to any one role or group of roles. It appears that the Caucasian American sample considered all roles to be equally worthy of financial support.

TABLE 55
THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE VARIOUS ROLES OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY BY THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

.(N = 846)

	$\bar{X}$	%
Formal Education Support Center	3.85	88.6
Independent Learning Center	3.81	84.7
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.80	83.4
Research Center	3.56	67.5
Community Information Center	3.56	65.1
Reference Library - Business	3.39	54.8
Reference Library - Personal	3.38	47.8
Popular Materials Library	3.37	52.3
Public Work Place	3.36	51.7
Community Activities Center	3.11	41.0

Note: N is the sample size and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. % represents the percentage of the sample that rated the role "very important." For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the % of respondents who rated the role "very important."

TABLE 56
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS FROM DIFFERENT REGIONS OF THE COUNTRY*

	Northeast (N = 190)		South Central (N = 264)		North Central (N = 220)		West (N = 172)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.76	84.5	3.88	90.4	3.87	90.5	3.86	88.1	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.79	83.5	3.78	81.4	3.86	86.7	3.79	82.1	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.37	49.6	3.36	47.9	3.34	44.0	3.47	50.7	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.34	54.4	3.45	60.5	3.33	48.7	3.42	54.3	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.02	39.2	3.13	39.6	3.10	41.7	3.17	44.1	n.s.	
Research Center	3.58	70.3	3.59	69.1	3.47	59.3	3.60	72.1	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.59	70.2	3.63	70.0	3.47	57.4	3.54	61.4	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.83	84.7	3.82	86.0	3.75	80.8	3.84	87.4	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.31	50.0	3.33	51.2	3.33	48.0	3.50	58.8	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.34	51.0	3.37	52.3	3.33	52.6	3.44	53.4	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 57
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS FROM COMMUNITIES WITH DIFFERENT SIZE POPULATIONS[*]

	Over 1,000,000 (N = 45)		250,000 - 1,000,000 (N = 88)		Under 250,000 (N = 713)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.86	89.2	3.94	95.6	3.84	87.8	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.65	73.1	3.82	82.4	3.81	84.2	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.41	55.9	3.42	50.9	3.37	47.0	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.34	55.4	3.44	54.1	3.39	54.8	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.05	38.9	3.20	45.9	3.10	40.5	n.s.	
Research Center	3.67	76.2	3.61	71.8	3.55	66.4	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.63	75.0	3.57	67.8	3.56	64.1	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.89	92.3	3.85	90.6	3.80	83.5	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.29	40.5	3.43	52.2	3.36	52.3	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.19	42.8	3.45	54.1	3.37	52.7	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{x}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 58
COMPARISONS BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE RESPONDENTS*

	Male (N = 400)		Female (N = 446)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.77	83.7	3.92	93.1	.000	.023
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.72	76.6	3.88	89.4	.000	.027
Reference Library - Personal	3.35	45.8	3.41	49.7	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.30	51.3	3.47	57.9	.002	.012
Community Activities Center	2.99	37.3	3.21	44.2	.001	.014
Research Center	3.44	59.7	3.67	74.5	.000	.026
Community Information Center	3.49	59.7	3.63	69.9	.003	.011
Independent Learning Center	3.76	81.5	3.85	87.5	.006	.009
Public Work Place	3.22	45.4	3.49	57.3	.000	.029
Popular Materials Library	3.23	43.8	3.49	59.9	.000	.027

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 59
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS FROM DIFFERENT AGE GROUPS*

	18-35 (N = 301)		36-50 (N = 224)		51-65 (N = 159)		66 and up (N = 156)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.81	87.0	3.88	90.2	3.88	89.6	3.84	88.1	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.84	85.1	3.79	81.9	3.76	83.2	3.78	81.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.38	45.2	3.41	49.4	3.38	47.3	3.33	51.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.44	55.7	3.39	52.9	3.37	54.4	3.30	56.0	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.07	38.3	3.00	35.0	3.25	48.6	3.18	47.5	n.s.	
Research Center	3.53	66.0	3.52	63.0	3.58	69.5	3.66	75.2	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.61	67.5	3.52	61.7	3.52	62.2	3.57	68.3	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.88	88.8	3.79	84.3	3.72	77.3	3.79	84.8	.011	.013
Public Work Place	3.31	47.7	3.28	44.1	3.45	58.5	3.49	63.3	.015	.013
Popular Materials Library	3.25	43.0	3.37	51.2	3.44	57.7	3.51	66.2	.005	.015

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 60
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON HIGHEST GRADE LEVEL COMPLETED*

	8th grade or less (N = 59)		9th-11th grade (N = 90)		12th grade (N = 328)		Some college (N = 179)		Completed college (N = 190)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.97	96.7	3.64	73.0	3.83	88.6	3.93	93.8	3.87	88.6	.000	.031
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.90	92.1	3.75	80.5	3.82	85.1	3.83	85.1	3.74	77.6	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.75	81.7	3.40	55.1	3.36	45.2	3.35	40.9	3.33	45.9	.001	.021
Reference Library - Business	3.65	79.6	3.30	48.8	3.43	55.9	3.40	54.8	3.29	48.5	.023	.014
Community Activities Center	3.41	60.4	3.00	37.9	3.09	42.0	3.11	38.4	3.09	37.7	n.s.	
Research Center	3.77	80.7	3.53	64.4	3.59	68.8	3.57	68.8	3.45	62.1	.041	.012
Community Information Center	3.73	75.3	3.66	71.4	3.61	69.8	3.54	62.5	3.40	53.7	.002	.021
Independent Learning Center	3.97	96.9	3.84	86.1	3.84	86.8	3.77	82.2	3.73	79.0	.009	.016
Public Work Place	3.59	67.6	3.62	69.5	3.43	54.0	3.26	44.8	3.15	41.4	.000	.039
Popular Materials Library	3.37	60.7	3.44	59.6	3.35	53.5	3.37	49.0	3.36	47.8	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 61
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON AWARD OF HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA[*]

	High school diploma (N = 346)		No high school diploma (N = 130)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.83	88.4	3.75	81.8	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	38.2	85.3	3.83	84.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.36	46.5	3.55	64.8	.010	.014
Reference Library - Business	3.42	56.5	3.47	59.8	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.13	42.4	3.07	46.1	n.s.	
Research Center	3.61	70.1	3.60	67.5	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.61	69.8	3.69	73.3	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.84	87.1	3.89	90.1	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.43	54.3	3.64	70.1	.005	.017
Popular Materials Library	3.38	54.8	3.33	57.3	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 62
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON MARITAL STATUS*

	Married (N = 518)		Widowed (N = 93)		Divorced (N = 86)		Never married (N = 147)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.85	88.2	3.92	93.6	3.93	95.8	3.75	83.3	.018	.012
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.78	81.8	3.84	89.9	3.90	90.2	3.80	80.8	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.37	46.6	3.49	62.8	3.38	49.0	3.34	42.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.40	54.6	3.48	67.6	3.31	52.2	3.35	49.6	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.08	39.3	3.35	56.4	3.19	41.9	3.00	37.1	.028	.011
Research Center	3.57	67.0	3.73	78.8	3.49	65.2	3.47	64.4	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.52	61.7	3.80	83.2	3.66	72.6	3.51	60.6	.001	.019
Independent Learning Center	3.78	82.5	3.87	90.2	3.85	88.7	3.86	87.0	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.34	50.0	3.65	70.6	3.39	53.6	3.26	45.7	.002	.018
Popular Materials Library	3.37	52.9	3.57	68.2	3.33	48.3	3.26	43.2	.029	.011

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 63
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN THE HOME*

	1 (N = 148)		2 (N = 294)		3 (N = 148)		4 (N = 151)		5 or more (N = 97)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.92	94.9	3.79	82.8	3.81	86.2	3.90	92.6	3.89	93.4	.038	.012
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.84	86.4	3.74	79.6	3.84	84.6	3.82	83.4	3.86	87.6	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.39	53.3	3.32	44.5	3.35	40.5	3.47	54.8	3.42	48.7	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.36	58.0	3.41	56.3	3.26	45.8	3.44	53.5	3.49	60.3	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.24	47.1	3.09	38.9	2.96	36.1	3.09	39.6	3.19	45.7	n.s.	
Research Center	3.64	76.5	3.54	66.6	3.50	61.7	3.56	66.4	3.56	66.7	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.69	73.9	3.47	59.6	3.49	57.6	3.63	71.4	3.63	68.9	.006	.017
Independent Learning Center	3.87	88.7	3.77	82.8	3.76	80.6	3.81	83.6	3.91	91.5	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.54	64.1	3.30	47.4	3.20	43.0	3.33	48.4	3.59	63.9	.000	.029
Popular Materials Library	3.45	57.8	3.37	53.8	3.20	40.4	3.36	51.6	3.45	56.9	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 64
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON NUMBER OF PRESCHOOLERS IN THE HOME[*]

	No preschoolers in the home (N = 536)		1 or more preschoolers in the home (N = 151)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.82	85.6	3.86	92.8	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.78	81.6	3.86	86.1	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.35	45.0	3.45	51.9	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.38	53.2	3.44	57.3	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.05	39.2	3.15	40.3	n.s.	
Research Center	3.54	65.9	3.56	65.2	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.48	59.4	3.73	75.8	.000	.022
Independent Learning Center	3.77	82.5	3.88	87.7	.029	.007
Public Work Place	3.29	47.2	3.44	55.7	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.34	50.8	3.36	50.9	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 65
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN THE HOME*

	No students in the home (N = 384)		1 or more students in the home (N = 305)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.78	83.3	3.90	92.1	.002	.014
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.77	80.9	3.83	84.6	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.34	44.7	3.42	48.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.38	53.9	3.41	54.0	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.08	38.5	3.06	40.4	n.s.	
Research Center	3.55	66.4	3.53	64.7	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.51	62.2	3.56	64.1	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.77	81.2	3.83	86.8	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.27	46.4	3.39	52.1	.049	.006
Popular Materials Library	3.34	51.4	3.35	50.0	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 66
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO ARE STUDENTS AND RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOT[*]

	Students (N = 84)		Non-students (N = 759)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.89	89.7	3.84	88.5	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.88	88.0	3.80	82.9	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.33	40.7	3.38	48.6	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.47	62.3	3.38	53.8	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.06	40.8	3.12	41.1	n.s.	
Research Center	3.54	63.8	3.56	68.0	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.65	69.5	3.55	64.5	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.89	89.4	3.80	84.1	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.43	53.3	3.35	51.5	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.33	49.2	3.37	52.6	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 67
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS WITH DIFFERENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS*

	Employed full time (N = 431)		Employed part time (N = 102)		Unemployed (N = 55)		Retired (N = 185)		Not in work force (N = 68)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.85	88.5	3.89	89.8	3.72	83.5	3.85	89.1	3.88	90.4	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.78	81.0	3.92	91.5	3.77	83.1	3.77	91.7	3.88	90.2	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.36	46.4	3.49	51.3	3.34	45.2	3.34	48.5	3.47	51.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.40	52.8	3.48	57.7	3.09	42.4	3.27	52.7	3.74	78.6	.000	.032
Community Activities Center	3.07	37.1	3.11	47.6	2.96	38.4	3.19	45.7	3.30	46.8	n.s.	
Research Center	3.50	62.9	3.57	70.8	3.53	69.4	3.66	74.7	3.69	72.3	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.54	63.4	3.55	64.7	3.57	62.6	3.54	64.4	3.74	79.6	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.81	84.5	3.79	83.0	3.80	83.7	3.78	83.8	3.89	89.9	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.27	46.3	3.44	53.7	3.41	52.4	3.44	58.6	3.56	63.3	.011	.016
Popular Materials Library	3.31	47.6	3.46	57.8	3.27	45.3	3.45	60.7	3.48	56.2	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 68
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS WITH DIFFERENT ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME[*]

	Less than $15,000 (N = 111)		$15,000-$29,999 (N = 221)		$30,000-$44,999 (N = 195)		$45,000-$59,999 (N = 96)		$60,000 or more (N = 103)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.78	88.5	3.85	90.5	3.92	93.3	3.95	94.6	3.78	81.3	.015	.017
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.88	89.8	3.82	84.5	3.83	85.3	3.77	82.7	3.69	73.2	.041	.014
Reference Library - Personal	3.51	63.0	3.34	46.2	3.43	49.6	3.34	43.8	3.37	48.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.49	67.0	3.40	52.8	3.46	58.3	3.27	45.5	3.33	54.5	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.22	50.4	3.11	45.8	3.10	38.0	3.10	37.5	3.01	34.2	n.s.	
Research Center	3.75	80.6	3.56	67.1	3.56	67.4	3.59	66.8	3.41	61.2	.018	.017
Community Information Center	3.78	81.3	3.54	63.3	3.58	66.6	3.50	58.8	3.40	55.9	.001	.026
Independent Learning Center	3.94	95.7	3.85	86.4	3.81	84.3	3.77	82.3	3.68	78.0	.004	.022
Public Work Place	3.75	78.5	3.37	52.6	3.33	49.4	3.21	43.6	3.16	38.7	.000	.052
Popular Materials Library	3.47	60.5	3.28	49.3	3.35	50.4	3.41	56.9	3.38	50.5	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 69
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO LIVE IN HOUSEHOLDS WITH INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE DISABILITIES AND RESPONDENTS WHO DO NOT[*]

	Disabilities (N = 119)		No disabilities (N = 712)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.89	90.0	3.84	88.5	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.79	81.6	3.80	83.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.40	52.6	3.38	47.1	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.44	62.3	3.38	53.5	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.15	46.7	3.10	40.1	n.s.	
Research Center	3.67	74.7	3.54	66.6	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.63	74.9	3.55	63.4	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.84	89.2	3.80	84.0	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.51	61.9	3.33	49.5	.023	.006
Popular Materials Library	3.43	58.4	3.35	51.2	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 70
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE A DISABILITY AND RESPONDENTS LIVING IN A HOUSEHOLD WHERE SOMEONE ELSE IS DISABLED*

	Respondent (N = 64)		Someone else (N = 46)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.85	87.0	3.92	92.1	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.80	85.5	3.74	74.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.49	61.3	3.22	38.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.54	73.4	3.22	41.7	.050	.035
Community Activities Center	3.19	51.9	3.02	35.0	n.s.	
Research Center	3.77	83.3	3.50	61.3	.041	.041
Community Information Center	3.69	77.9	3.53	70.4	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.88	90.0	3.75	86.0	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.68	73.0	3.26	44.1	.003	.079
Popular Materials Library	3.58	67.1	3.21	41.7	.015	.056

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 71
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO VOTED AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT VOTE IN THE 1988 ELECTION*

	Voted (N = 552)		Did not vote (N = 287)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.88	89.6	3.79	86.9	.019	.007
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.78	81.3	3.86	87.3	.020	.007
Reference Library - Personal	3.37	47.1	3.39	48.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.35	53.3	3.46	57.6	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.13	41.6	3.05	39.5	n.s.	
Research Center	3.54	66.1	3.59	69.7	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.54	64.0	3.60	67.3	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.76	81.7	3.89	90.0	.000	.016
Public Work Place	3.34	50.2	3.39	54.0	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.43	55.0	3.24	47.3	.001	.014

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{x}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 72
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON PERSONAL FINANCIAL SITUATION COMPARED TO LAST YEAR*

	Better off (N = 208)		Worse off (N = 194)		About the same (N = 492)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.81	86.5	3.85	87.7	3.87	90.1	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.78	79.9	3.76	82.1	3.84	85.9	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.43	51.8	3.36	48.6	3.37	45.8	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.40	56.0	3.35	50.9	3.41	56.2	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.10	43.4	3.09	37.6	3.12	41.6	n.s.	
Research Center	3.42	61.0	3.64	73.1	3.59	68.1	.005	.013
Community Information Center	3.50	63.5	3.66	70.2	3.55	64.0	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.80	84.9	3.85	86.1	3.80	83.7	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.28	47.3	3.39	51.0	3.39	54.2	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.26	46.5	3.42	55.6	3.40	53.6	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 73
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON PERSONAL FINANCIAL SITUATION EXPECTED FOR NEXT YEAR[*]

	Better off (N = 360)		Worse off (N = 65)		About the same (N = 385)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.83	88.0	3.78	83.1	3.87	89.9	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.79	80.9	3.65	78.9	3.84	86.0	.011	.011
Reference Library - Personal	3.38	44.6	3.20	41.5	3.42	52.6	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.38	53.4	3.30	52.9	3.43	56.3	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	2.99	33.5	3.09	45.8	3.22	46.6	.003	.014
Research Center	3.53	66.8	3.40	60.3	3.62	69.6	.037	.008
Community Information Center	3.56	66.2	3.57	61.7	3.56	64.5	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.80	84.5	3.82	85.8	3.82	84.5	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.31	46.4	3.31	51.7	3.44	57.0	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.30	46.7	3.36	55.3	3.44	57.3	.047	.008

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 74
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO VISITED AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT VISIT THE PUBLIC LIBRARY IN THE LAST YEAR[*]

	Visited library (N = 488)		Did not visit library (N = 351)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.90	92.1	3.77	83.6	.000	.017
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.83	84.8	3.77	81.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.42	49.8	3.32	45.5	.038	.005
Reference Library - Business	3.41	54.2	3.36	55.4	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.13	42.0	3.07	39.5	n.s.	
Research Center	3.53	66.8	3.60	69.0	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.54	62.9	3.59	68.6	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.81	84.6	3.81	84.8	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.32	48.4	3.41	55.8	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.41	53.7	3.30	50.7	.042	.005

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 75
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS BASED ON WHETHER SOMEONE ELSE WENT TO THE PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR THEM IN THE LAST YEAR*

	Yes (N = 197)		No (N = 647)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.94	94.9	3.82	86.7	.002	.012
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.82	83.2	3.80	83.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.40	44.2	3.38	49.1	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.35	52.7	3.40	55.5	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.06	38.8	3.12	41.7	n.s.	
Research Center	3.57	65.0	3.55	68.3	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.56	64.7	3.56	65.4	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.81	87.3	3.81	83.8	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.28	46.4	3.38	53.3	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.33	50.3	3.38	52.9	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

Caucasian American Sample

TABLE 76
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO CALLED THE PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR INFORMATION IN THE LAST YEAR AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT*

	Called library (N = 199)		Did not call library (N = 646)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.94	94.9	3.82	86.7	.002	.012
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.83	85.4	3.80	82.9	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.46	52.3	3.35	46.5	.050	.005
Reference Library - Business	3.47	59.5	3.37	53.4	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.17	42.1	3.09	40.7	n.s.	
Research Center	3.51	60.7	3.57	69.7	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.62	68.6	3.54	63.9	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.79	83.2	3.82	85.1	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.39	52.3	3.35	51.4	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.41	53.6	3.36	52.0	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 77
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO IN ANY WAY USED THE PUBLIC LIBRARY IN THE LAST YEAR AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT*

	Users (N = 547)		Non-users (N = 299)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.89	90.8	3.78	84.7	.002	.012
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.82	84.2	3.78	82.0	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.42	49.4	3.30	44.9	.019	.017
Reference Library - Business	3.40	54.1	3.38	56.0	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.14	42.2	3.04	38.7	n.s.	
Research Center	3.54	66.4	3.59	69.5	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.55	63.6	3.59	67.9	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.80	84.4	3.82	85.1	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.33	49.0	3.43	56.6	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.40	54.3	3.31	48.7	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 78
CAUCASIAN AMERICANS' OPINIONS ABOUT LEVELS OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARY SERVICES

Amount	Frequency	Percent	Adjusted Percent*
$ 0	0	0.0	0.0
$ 1 - $20	292	34.5	39.6
$21 - $40	224	26.5	30.4
$41 - $60	113	13.3	15.3
$61 - $80	43	5.0	5.8
$81 - $100	35	4.2	4.8
$101 -	31	3.6	4.2
Don't Know	109	12.9	Missing
Total	846		

---

*Note: Percentages recalculated with missing respondents excluded.

TABLE 79
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	C.I.
Entire Sample	737	\$33.65	\$31.68 - \$35.61

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Region of country			.001	.027	
Northeast	167	\$41.61			\$36.75 - \$46.47
South Central	225	\$30.51			\$27.24 - \$33.78
North Central	186	\$30.57			\$26.88 - \$34.25
West	157	\$33.33			\$29.37 - \$37.29
Size of community			.039	.009	
Over 1,000,000	38	\$44.35			\$33.78 - \$54.93
250,000 - 1,000,000	80	\$33.80			\$27.29 - \$40.31
Under 250,000	617	\$32.95			\$30.87 - \$35.04
Gender			n.s.	--	
Males	352	\$35.25			\$32.31 - \$38.14
Females	385	\$32.18			\$29.55 - \$34.82
Age			n.s.	--	
18 - 35	280	\$35.30			
36 - 50	206	\$33.97			\$30.02 - \$38.58
51 - 65	135	\$31.69			\$30.46 - \$37.48
66 and up	110	\$31.20			\$25.80 - \$36.60

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 79 (continued)
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Highest grade level completed			n.s.	--	
8th grade or less	36	$30.40			$22.50 - $38.29
9th - 11th grade	69	$34.48			$26.34 - $42.61
12th grade	290	$30.39			$27.30 - $33.48
Some college	166	$36.53			$32.50 - $40.56
Completed college	172	$36.79			$32.92 - $40.66
High school diploma or equivalent			.017	.014	
Yes	307	$29.31			$26.38 - $32.24
No	89	$37.25			$30.39 - $44.11
Marital status			n.s.	--	
Married	459	$32.48			$30.07 - $34.89
Widowed	59	$31.27			$23.95 - $38.59
Divorced	80	$34.36			$28.43 - $40.29
Never married	137	$38.09			$33.10 - $43.08
# of people living in the home			n.s.	--	
one	109	$35.78			$30.25 - $41.31
two	256	$31.12			$27.82 - $34.42
three	138	$33.61			$28.97 - $38.26
four	137	$36.32			$31.64 - $41.00
five or more	91	$33.49			$28.67 - $38.31

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 79 (continued)
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS[*]

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
# of preschool children in the home			n.s.	--	
No preschoolers	487	$32.33			$29.99 - $34.67
One or more preschoolers	135	$36.39			$31.59 - $41.19
# of students in the home			n.s.	--	
No students	341	$33.32			$30.28 - $36.36
One or more students	280	$32.95			$30.09 - $35.81
Respondents who are students			.034	.006	
Students	79	$39.75			$33.84 - $45.66
Non-students	657	$32.91			$30.83 - $34.99
Employment status			n.s.	--	
Employed full time	398	$33.48			$30.98 - $35.98
Employed part time	95	$35.57			$29.74 - $41.40
Unemployed	45	$36.07			$26.98 - $45.15
Retired	138	$31.88			$26.89 - $36.87
Not in work force	56	$33.15			$25.93 - $40.36
Annual household income			n.s.	--	
Less than $15,000	82	$33.14			$26.24 - $40.04
$15,000 - $29,999	200	$32.73			$28.74 - $36.71
$30,000 - $44,999	184	$34.81			$31.04 - $38.57
$45,000 - $59,999	88	$35.41			$29.64 - $41.17
$60,000 or more	96	$34.96			$30.52 - $39.39

---

[*] Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 79 (continued)
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS[*]

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Disabled person in household			n.s.	--	
Yes	99	$36.39			$29.96 - $42.83
No	629	$33.31			$31.24 - $35.37
Respondent disabled			n.s.	--	
Yes	51	$38.82			$29.06 - $48.57
No	39	$31.03			$22.95 - $39.12
Voted in '88 election			n.s.	--	
Yes	479	$34.88			$32.44 - $37.32
No	256	$31.42			$28.09 - $34.75
Current financial situation			n.s.	--	
Better off than last year	185	$34.08			$30.16 - $38.00
Worse off than last year	168	$33.27			$28.89 - $37.65
About the same	379	$33.70			$31.02 - $35.39
Future financial situation			n.s.	--	
Better off next year	333	$35.23			$32.23 - $38.23
Worse off next year	53	$36.62			$29.14 - $44.11
About the same	333	$31.54			$28.69 - $34.39

---

[*] Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 80
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES BETWEEN LIBRARY USERS AND NON-USERS[*]

	N	$\bar{X}$	C.I.
Entire Sample	737	$33.65	$31.68 - $35.61

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Respondent went to public library last year			.046	.005	
Yes	445	$35.35			$32.87 - $37.83
No	285	$31.23			$27.97 - $34.50
Someone else went to library for respondent			n.s.	--	
Yes	176	$36.44			$32.75 - $40.14
No	559	$32.74			$30.44 - $35.05
Respondent called library for information			.010	.009	
Yes	186	$38.07			$34.10 - $42.03
No	549	$32.18			$29.92 - $34.44
Respondent used library in any way last year			n.s.	--	
Yes	492	$34.71			$32.39 - $37.04
No	244	$31.50			$27.86 - $35.13

---

[*] Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 111. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

PART IV. THE SURVEY OF HISPANIC AMERICANS

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

The Hispanic American sample included 399 respondents. The data from this sample were weighted to ensure that the demographic characteristics of the weighted sample conformed to the latest available Census Bureau estimates of the characteristics of the national Hispanic American population for age, gender, race, formal education attainment, and region of country. The demographic characteristics of the sample are as follows:[1]

Region of country[2]	13.1% northeast 32.7% south central 9.0% north central 45.3% west
% of population which is Hispanic American[3]	23.6% high (over 40% Hispanic American) 30.4% moderate (11% - 40% Hispanic American) 46.0% low (less than 11% Hispanic American)
Gender	48.1% male 51.9% female

---

[1] The frequency distributions for the responses to all the questions in the interview are presented in the Appendix for this report. The Appendix is a separately bound publication.

[2] These regional areas are defined by The Gallup Organization as follows: northeastern states = Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont; south central states = Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Washington D.C., Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia; north central states = Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin; western states = Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

[3] As part of the sampling procedure for the Hispanic American sample, the Gallup Organization identified telephone area codes for areas that contained certain estimated proportions of Hispanic Americans in the population. These strata were classified as heavy (.41 - 1.00), moderate (.11 - .40), and light (0 - .10). These strata were not based on the size of the community but rather on the estimated proportion of the community, regardless of its size, which is Hispanic American. Using this rule, an inner city neighborhood which is predominately Hispanic American could be included in the same stratum as a rural community which is predominantly Hispanic American.

Age	48.6%	18 - 35 years
	24.1%	36 - 50 years
	15.5%	51 - 65 years
	10.3%	66 years and older
	1.9%	missing
National ancestry	32.3%	Mexican
	35.2%	Mexican American
	11.8%	Puerto Rican
	2.7%	Cuban
	17.3%	Other
	.6%	missing
Grade level completed	25.5%	8th grade or less
	18.5%	9th - 11th grade
	30.7%	12th grade
	13.4%	some college
	1.7%	associate degree
	7.0%	bachelor's degree
	.6%	master's degree
	1.5%	professional/doctoral
	1.4%	missing
Marital status	56.2%	married
	3.5%	widowed
	8.9%	divorced
	26.7%	never married
	4.6%	missing
Living with spouse	53.6%	yes
	2.6%	no
	43.8%	missing
# of people living in home	6.3%	one
	23.1%	two
	19.9%	three
	20.2%	four
	10.7%	five
	15.8%	six or more
	4.1%	missing
# of preschool children in home	64.9%	zero
	18.2%	one
	5.0%	two
	.9%	three
	.7%	four
	10.4%	missing

# of school children in home	45.9%	zero
	20.3%	one
	14.0%	two
	6.6%	three
	2.8%	four or more
	10.4%	missing
Respondents who were students	7.4%	high school
	2.3%	non-academic program
	7.4%	college students
	1.2%	graduate students
	81.8%	missing
Primary language spoken at home	50.7%	English
	45.3%	Spanish
	4.0%	missing
Employment status	49.9%	employed full-time
	11.4%	employed part-time
	7.6%	unemployed
	10.4%	retired
	16.9%	not in work force
	3.8%	missing
Household income	5.1%	less than $5,000
	10.6%	$ 5,000 - $ 9,999
	10.3%	$10,000 - $14,999
	11.1%	$15,000 - $19,999
(Median interval)	8.2%	$20,000 - $24,999
	8.3%	$25,000 - $29,999
	7.2%	$30,000 - $34,999
	5.8%	$35,000 - $39,999
	5.3%	$40,000 - $44,999
	1.5%	$45,000 - $49,999
	4.7%	$50,000 - $54,999
	.1%	$55,000 - $59,999
	.9%	$60,000 - $64,999
	.3%	$65,000 - $69,999
	1.9%	$70,000 - $74,999
	2.9%	$75,000 or more
	15.8%	missing
Disabled person in household	13.2%	yes
	82.2%	no
	4.7%	missing

Respondent disabled	2.8%	yes
	9.8%	someone else
	87.4%	missing
Nature of disability	0.1%	sight
	1.4%	mobility
	98.5%	missing
Voted in '88 election	36.0%	yes
	61.0%	no
	3.0%	missing
Current financial situation	25.6%	better off than last year
	24.1%	worse off than last year
	47.2%	about the same
	3.2%	missing
Future financial situation	50.1%	better off next year
	7.0%	worse off next year
	28.5%	about the same
	14.4%	missing.

LIBRARY USE AMONG THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

The data indicated that 51.7% of the sample had personally gone to a public library in the past year, 22.2% of the sample reported that someone else had obtained materials for them, and 20.1% of the sample had called a library for information. Controlling for overlap among these activities, it was determined that 60.8% of the sample had in some way used a public library in the last year while 32.9% of the sample reported no use of a library.

EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

The responses to the role evaluation questions were analyzed in two ways: first, mean scores for the role importance scales were calculated; and second, the percentages of respondents who for each role selected the category "very important" were tabulated. While the mean importance scale score yields a more precise estimate of the respondents' evaluations of the importance of a role, the percentage of respondents who selected the category "very important" is the more easily understood and communicated estimate of the importance of a role. All of the tables presenting results of role evaluations present both the mean scale scores and the percentage "scores."

The results of the role evaluations are reported in Table 81 in ranked order from the role receiving the highest mean importance scale score to the role receiving the lowest mean importance scale score. These results can be interpreted in two ways: first, the scores for any given role can be interpreted in terms of their position or standing on the four-point importance scale (an absolute assessment); and second, the scores for any given role can be interpreted in terms of their ranking relative to the scores received by the other roles (a relative assessment). For example, more than half of the sample (57.4%) rated the Popular Materials Library role as "very important" with a mean score of 3.46, but this rating places the role in the last position of importance compared to the mean scores received by the other roles. The reader should note that the ranking by mean score is not the same as the ranking by the percentage "score." The reader should also note that the distance between the mean scores for some of the roles is quite small indicating that, while one role is ranked higher or lower than another role, for all practical purposes the roles are about equal in importance. The same observation could also be made for the percentage "scores."

The results in Table 81 indicate that a majority of the Hispanic American considered all of the ten roles to be "very important." Of these, however, the Independent Learning Center role, the Formal Education Support Center role, the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role, the Community Information Center role, and the Research Center role received the highest ratings of importance. These results strongly suggest that the Hispanic American respondents considered the public library's role of supporting the educational aspirations of the community and providing community information to be its most important roles.

In evaluating these results the reader should also keep in mind some of the anomalies in the role statements and the public's interpretations of the role statements that were discussed on pages 17-19.

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY DIFFERENT SEGMENTS OF THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

The respondents' opinions about the importance of each role were tested for differences between or among groups of respondents using analysis of variance.[4] The different groups of

---

[4] Analysis of variance is a statistical procedure for testing whether the observed differences among group means for each role evaluation occurred by chance or because the groups differed in their evaluations of the importance of the role. A statistically significant difference among the group means is defined as one whose probability of occurring by chance (the α level reported in the tables) is so low that we choose to conclude that the difference did not occur by chance but that it occurred because the groups differed in their evaluation of the role. All differences with an α level of .05 or less (that is, the probability that the difference occurred by chance is 5 out of a hundred or less) are considered to be statistically significant. The α levels for all statistically significant differences are reported in the tables. All differences with an α level greater than .05 (that is, the probability that the difference occurred by chance is greater than 5 out of a hundred) are considered to be non-significant and are designated as such in the table with the initials n.s.

A non-trivial difference is defined as a statistically significant difference whose magnitude of difference is sufficiently large that it warrants attention for possible usefulness in managerial decision making. By contrast, a trivial difference is defined as a statistically significant difference whose magnitude of difference is so small or trivial as to be of questionable value in managerial decision making. Deciding whether a statistically significant difference is trivial or non-trivial is a judgement call. We have adopted the rule that if R^2, the coefficient of determination, is equal to or greater than .02 the difference is considered to be non-trivial. The coefficient of determination measures the amount of variation in the role evaluation scores that is explained by the group differences - the larger respondents were identified by, or created from, the following characteristics: the region of the country where the respondent lived; the relative size (in %) of the Hispanic proportion of the community in which the respondent lived; the gender of the respondent; the age of the respondent; the national ancestry of the respondent; the highest grade level of education completed by the respondent and, if the respondent completed 12 grades or less, whether the respondent had a high school diploma; whether, if the respondent had an associate degree, the respondent graduated from an academic program or an occupational program; the respondent's current marital status and, if married, whether the respondent was currently living with a spouse; the number of people living in the respondent's home; the number of preschool children living in the home; the number of students living in the home; whether the respondent was currently a student and, if so, the nature of the program of study; the primary language spoken at home; the respondent's current employment status; total annual household income; whether anyone in the household was disabled; whether the respondent was disabled and, if so, the nature of the disability; whether the respondent voted in the last (i.e., 1988) presidential election; the respondent's opinion about his or her current financial situation; the respondent's opinion about his or her financial situation next year; whether the respondent personally went to a public library in the past year and, if so, how many times; whether anyone else went to a library for the respondent; whether the respondent called a library for information in the past year; and whether the respondent made any use of a library in the past year.

In the preceding analyses, the quantitative characteristics of the respondents (age, highest grade level of education completed, the number of people living in the home, the number of preschool children living in the home, the number of students living in the home, and total annual household income) were grouped into intervals (e.g., respondents 18 to 35 years old, respondents 36 to 50 years old, etc.) and the mean role importance scale scores for these groups were compared for differences using analysis of variance. This was done in order to facilitate comparisons to local data which oftentimes are available only in this grouped format. Another way of analyzing whether any of these characteristics of the respondents is related to the respondents' evaluations of the importance of the roles is by means of correlation analysis[5] which tests for the presence of a trend between the characteristic and the role importance score. For example, as the age of the respondents increases does their evaluation of the importance of

---

the coefficient of determination, the more meaningful the difference. The coefficients of determination for all statistically significant differences are reported in the tables so assessments about triviality can be made.

[5] A correlation coefficient is an index of the strength of the relationship between two quantitative variables. The coefficient can take a value from -1.00 (indicating a perfect inverse relationship) to 0.00 (indicating the absence of any relationship) to +1.00 (indicating a perfect positive relationship). Typically, correlation coefficients appear either as a negative decimal value (indicating that high scores for one variable are associated with low scores for the other variable) or as a positive decimal value (indicating that high scores for one variable are associated with high scores for the other variable). The higher the decimal value, the stronger the relationship.

A statistically significant relationship is defined as one whose probability of occurrence by chance is so low that we choose to conclude that it did not occur by chance but that it occurred because the two variables are related. A non-trivial relationship is defined as a statistically significant relationship of sufficient strength that it warrants attention for possible usefulness in managerial decision making. In this report, correlation coefficients equal to or greater than ±.15 are considered to be non-trivial.

a role tend to increase or decrease? In order to determine if trends such as this exist, each of these quantitative characteristics of the respondents was also entered into a correlation analysis with each of the role importance scales.

While the results of the analyses of variance with the grouped data and the results of the correlation analyses with the ungrouped data are complementary, it should be noted that the correlation analyses are not always sensitive to a difference between two or more groups which might exist. Consequently, the results of the two tests sometimes do not agree. The results of both sets of analyses are reported below.

Region of the country. There were eight statistically significant differences among respondents living in the four regions of the country (see Table 82). In general, respondents from the western states exhibited a pattern of differences. These respondents rated the Formal Education Support role lower than all other respondents, the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role lower than respondents from the northeast states, the Reference Library for personal information role lower than respondents from the northeast and north central states, the Research Center role lower than all other respondents, the Community Information Center role lower than respondents from the northeast and south central states, and the Popular Materials Library role lower than respondents from the north central states. In addition, respondents from the south central states rated the Reference Library for personal information role lower than respondents from the northeast states, respondents from the northeast states rated the Reference Library for businesses role higher than all other respondents, respondents from the north central states rated the Public Work Place role higher than all other respondents, and respondents from the south central states rated the Popular Materials Library role lower than respondents from the northeast states and the north central states. All of these differences were non-trivial.

% of community which is Hispanic American. There were three statistically significant differences among the evaluations of the roles by respondents living in areas with different percentages of Hispanic Americans in the community (see Table 83). Respondents living in communities with moderate percentages (11% - 40%) rated the Formal Education Support Center role lower than respondents living in communities with low percentages (less than 11%) and high percentages (more than 40%), the Reference Library for business role higher than respondents living in communities with low percentages and the Popular Materials Library role lower than respondents living in communities with low or high percentages. The latter two differences, however, were trivial.

Gender. There was one statistically significant difference between males and females (see Table 84). Male respondents rated the Popular Materials Library role lower than female respondents.

Age. There were two statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between the age of the respondents and their evaluations of the importance of the roles. The age of the respondents was inversely related to their evaluations of the importance of the Community Activities Center role (r = -.17); the younger the respondents, the higher their evaluations of importance (or, the older the respondents, the lower their evaluations of importance). The age of the respondents was positively related to their evaluations of the importance of the Research Center role (r = .15); the older the respondents, the higher their evaluations of importance.

The respondents were also divided into four age groups: 18 - 35 years old; 36 - 50 years old; 51 - 65 years old; and over 65 years old. Comparisons of the mean importance scale sores for these four groups indicated that there were seven statistically significant and non-trivial differences among the groups (see Table 85). Respondents who were 66 years or older rated the Reference Library for personal information role lower rating than all other age groups, the Reference Library for business role higher than the 18 - 35 year old and 36 - 50 year old groups, the Community Activities Center role lower than all other age groups, the Research Center role higher than the 18 - 35 year old group, and the Public Work Place role lower than all other age groups. In addition, respondents who were 18 - 35 years old rated the Formal Education Support Center role lower than respondents who were 36 - 50 years old, the Reference Library for personal information role lower than respondents who were 36 - 50 years old, and the Popular Materials Library role lower than respondents who were 36 - 50 years old. Respondents who were 51 - 65 rated the Public Work Place role lower than respondents who were 18 - 35 and 36 - 50 years old.

National ancestry. There were three statistically significant and non-trivial differences among the role evaluations by respondents with different national ancestries (see Table 86). Respondents of Puerto Rican ancestry rated the Formal Education Support Center role lower than all of the other ancestry groups, the Reference Library for personal information role higher than all of the other ancestry groups, and the Research Center role lower than all of the other ancestry groups.

Highest grade level completed. There was one statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficient between highest grade level completed and the evaluations of the importance of the roles. Highest grade level completed was positively correlated with the respondents' rating of the importance of the Formal Education Support role ($r = .19$); the higher the grade level completed, the higher the evaluations of the importance of the role.

The respondents were divided into five groups based on the number of grades completed: 8th grade or less, 9th - 11th grades, 12th grade, some college; and college graduates. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for these five groups indicated that there were six statistically significant and non-trivial differences (see Table 87). Respondents who had completed the 8th grade or less rated the Formal Education Support Center role lower than all other groups; respondents who had graduated from college rated the Reference Library for personal information role lower than all other groups; respondents who had completed 9th - 11th grades rated the Community Activities Center role higher than all other groups; respondents who had completed the 8th grade or less rated the Community Activities Center role lower than respondents who had some college; respondents who had completed college rated the Independent Learning Center lower than respondents who had completed the 8th grade or less, and respondents who had completed 9th - 11th grades; respondents who had completed 9th - 11th grades rated the Public Work Place role higher than respondents who had completed the 8th grade or less, respondents who had graduated high school, and respondents who had completed college; and respondents who had completed the 8th grade or less rated the Popular Materials Library role lower than respondents who had completed 9th - 11th grades and respondents who had completed 12th grade.

Whether, if the respondent had completed the 12th grade or less, the respondent had a high school diploma or equivalent. There were two statistically significant, but trivial, differences in the role evaluations of respondents who had and respondents who did not have a high school diploma (see Table 88). Respondents who had a high school diploma rated the Community Information Center role lower and the Popular Materials Library role higher than respondents who did not have a high school diploma.

Whether, if the respondent had an associate degree, the respondent graduated from an academic program or an occupational program. There were too few responses to this question to permit group comparisons.

Marital status. There were three statistically significant and non-trivial differences among the role evaluations of respondents with different marital status[6] (see Table 89). Respondents who had never married rated the Reference Library for personal information lower than all other groups, the Reference Library for business role lower than all other groups, the Community Activities Center role higher than respondents who had married, and the Popular Materials Library lower than all other groups.

Whether a married respondent was currently living with a spouse. The number of married respondents currently not living with a spouse was too small to permit meaningful comparisons.

The number of people living in the home. There were three statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between the number of people living in the home and the evaluations of the importance of the roles. The higher the number of people living in the home, the higher the evaluations of the importance of the Reference Library for business role (r = .19), the Community Activities Center role (r = .20), and the Public Work Place role (r = .20).

Based on the number of people living in the home, the respondents were divided into six groups: respondents living in homes with one person, two people, three people, four people, five people, and six or more people. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for these six groups indicated that there were eight statistically significant and non-trivial differences (see Table 90). Respondents living in homes with six or more people rated the Reference Library for personal information higher than all other groups. Respondents living in homes with six or more people rated the Reference Library for business higher than all other groups and respondents living in homes with three people and with five people rated this role higher than respondents living in homes with one, two, or four people. Respondents living in homes with two people rated the Community Activities Center role lower than all other groups. Respondents living in homes with six or more people rated the Research Center role higher than all other groups, and respondents living in homes with five people rated this role higher than people living in homes with two people. Respondents living in homes with two people rated the Community Information role lower than respondents living in homes with three or more people. Respondents living alone rated the Independent Learning Center role lower than all other respondents. Respondents living in homes with one or two people rated the Public Work Place role lower than all other respondents. Respondents living in homes with six or more people rated the Popular Materials Library role higher than all other respondents.

---

[6] Respondents who were widowed numbered only 14 individuals and consequently were not included in the comparisons.

The number of preschool children living in the home. There was one statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficient between the number of preschoolers living in the home and the respondents' evaluations of the importance of the roles. The higher the number of preschoolers living in the home, the higher the evaluation of the importance of the Reference Library for business role (r = .17).

Because of the low number of multiple preschoolers in the home, the respondents were divided into two groups: respondents living in homes without any preschoolers and respondents in homes with one or more preschoolers. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for these two groups indicated that there were five statistically significant differences (see Table 91). Respondents living in homes with one or more preschoolers rated the Reference Library for business role, the Community Activities Center role, the Research Center role, the Public Work Place role, and the Popular Materials Library role higher than respondents living in homes with no preschoolers. The differences for the Community Activities Center role and the Research Center role were trivial. The differences for the Reference Library for business role, the Public Work Place role, and the Popular Materials Library role were non-trivial.

The number of students living in the home. There were four statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between the number of students living in the home and the evaluations of the importance of the roles. The higher the number of students living in the home, the higher the evaluations of the importance of the Reference Library for personal information role (r = .27), the Reference Library for business role (r = .15), the Community Activities Center role (r = .16), and the Public Work Place role (r = .17).

Because of the low number of multiple students in the home, the respondents were divided into two groups: respondents living in homes without any students and respondents in homes with one or more students. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for these two groups indicated that there were three statistically significant differences (see Table 92). Respondents living in homes with one or more students rated the Reference Library for personal information role, the Community Activities Center role, and the Public Work Place role higher than respondents living in homes with no students. The latter two differences were trivial.

Whether the respondent was currently a student. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for respondents who were students enrolled in school or a training program and respondents who were not indicated that there were three statistically significant differences (see Table 93). Respondents who were enrolled in school or a training program rated the Reference Library for business role lower, the Community Activities Center role higher, and the Popular Materials Library role lower than respondents who were not students. The differences for the Reference Library for business role and the Popular Materials Library role were trivial.

Nature of the program of study. The number of responses to this question was too small to permit group comparisons.

The language spoken at home. The only two languages identified by the respondents were English and Spanish. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores of these two groups of respondents indicated that there were six statistically significant differences (see Table 94). Respondents from English speaking homes rated the Formal Education Support Center role higher than respondents from Spanish speaking homes. Respondents from Spanish speaking homes rated the Reference Library for personal information role, the Reference Library for business role, the Community Activities Center role, the Public Work Place role, and the Popular Materials role higher than respondents from English speaking homes. The differences for both the Reference Library roles were trivial.

Employment status. There were seven statistically significant and non-trivial differences among groups of respondents with different employment status (see Table 95). Respondents who were employed part time rated the Formal Education Support Center role lower than all of the other groups. Respondents who were retired rated the Reference Library for personal information role lower than respondents who were employed full time, who were employed part time, and who were not in the work force. Respondents who were retired rated the Community Activities Center role lower than all other groups. Respondents who were employed part time rated the Research center role lower than respondents who were employed full time, who were retired, and who were not in the work force.. Respondents who were employed part time rated the Community Information Center role lower than respondents who were not in the work force. Respondents who were unemployed rated the Independent Learning Center role lower than respondents who were employed part time, and who were not in the work force. Respondents who were retired and respondents who were unemployed rated the Public Work Place role lower than respondents who were employed part time.

Total annual household income. There were three statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients between total annual household income and the evaluations of the importance of the roles. The lower the household income, the higher the evaluations of the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role (r = -.20), the Reference Library for personal information role (r = -.22), and the Reference Library for business role (r = -.21); or, the higher the household income, the lower the evaluations of the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role, the Reference Library for personal information role, and the Reference Library for business role.

Based on the amount of total annual household income, the respondents were divided into five groups: respondents living in households with incomes of less than $10,000, $10,000 to $19,999, $20,000 to $29,999, $30,000 to $39,999, and $40,000 or more. Comparisons of the mean importance scale scores for these five groups indicated that there were six statistically significant and non-trivial differences (see Table 96). Respondents living in households with incomes less than $10,000 rated the Formal Education Support role lower than all other groups. Respondents living in households with incomes of $40,000 or more rated the Reference Library for personal information lower than all other income groups, while respondents living in households with incomes less than $10,000 rated this role higher than all other groups. Respondents living in households with incomes of $40,000 or more rated the Reference Library for business role lower than all other income groups, while respondents living in households with incomes less than $10,000 and with incomes between $20,000 and $29,999 rated this role lower than respondents living in households with incomes of $10,000 - $19,999 and with incomes of $30,000 - $39,999. Respondents living in households with incomes less than $10,000 and with incomes of $40,000 or more rated the Research Center role lower than the other income groups. Respondents who lived in households with incomes between $10,000 - $19,999 and with incomes of $40,000 or more rated the Public Work Place role lower that respondents living in households with incomes of less than $10,000. Respondents living in households with incomes of $10,000 -

$19,999 and with incomes of $40,000 or more rated the Popular Materials Library lower than the other income groups.

Whether anyone in the household was disabled. There were five statistically significant differences between respondents living in households with a disabled person and respondents living in households without a disabled person (see Table 97). Respondents with a disabled person in the household rated the Reference Library for personal information role higher, the Community Activities Center role lower, the Research Center role higher, the Public Work Place role lower, and the Popular Materials Library role higher than respondents in households without a disabled person. All of these difference, with the exception of the difference for the Community Activities Center role, were trivial.

Whether the respondent was disabled. The number of disabled respondents was too small to permit comparisons.

The nature of the disability. The number of disabled respondents was too small to permit comparisons.

Whether the respondent voted in the last (1988) presidential election. There were five statistically significant differences between respondents who voted and respondents who did not vote in the last election (see Table 98). Respondents who voted rated the Reference Library for personal information role, the Reference Library for business role, the Community Activities Center role, the Public Work Place role, and the Popular Materials Library role lower than respondents who did not vote. The differences for the Reference Library for business role and the Popular Materials Library role were trivial.

The respondent's opinion about his/her current financial condition. There were three statistically significant and non-trivial differences among respondents (see Table 99). Respondents who felt that their current financial condition was worse than last year rated the Formal Education Support Center lower than respondents who felt that they were about the same as last year or better off than last year. Respondents who felt that their current financial condition was worse than last year rated the Community Information Center role lower than respondents who felt that they were about the same as last year. Respondents who felt that they were better off than last year rated the Popular Materials Library lower than respondents who felt that they were about the same as last year.

The respondents's opinion about his/her financial condition next year. There were three statistically significant and non-trivial differences among the respondents (see Table 100). Respondents who felt who felt that their financial condition would be about the same next year rated the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role lower than respondents who felt that they would be better off and respondents who felt that they would be worse off next year. Respondents who felt that they would be better off next year rated the Reference Library for business role higher than respondents who felt that they would be worse off and respondents who felt that they would be about the same next year. Respondents who felt that they would be better off next year rated the Public Work Place role higher than respondents who felt that they would be worse off next year.

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

Each of the role importance scales was tested for differences among respondents (using analysis of variance) based on the following library use behaviors: whether or not the respondent had gone to a public library in the past year, whether or not someone else had gone to a library to obtain materials for the respondent, whether or not the respondent had called a library for information in the past year, and a constructed measure of any kind of use of a public library - whether or not a respondent answered "yes" to any one of the three "use"questions. The results of these analyses are reported below.

Whether the respondent had gone to a public library in the past year. There were two statistically significant and non-trivial differences between respondents who had gone and respondents who had not gone to a public library in the past year (see Table 101). Respondents who had gone to a library rated the Formal Education Support Center role and the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role higher than respondents who had not gone to a library.

Respondents who indicated that they had gone to a library in the past year were also asked how many times they had gone to a library and were provided six numerical response categories which were converted into a six-point scale. This frequency of visit scale was also entered into correlation analyses with each of the role importance scales. The results of these analyses indicated that there were three statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients. The frequency of visit scale was inversely related to the ratings of the importance of both the Reference Library for business role ($r = -.21$) and the Research Center role ($r = -.16$), and positively related to the ratings of the importance of the Public Work Place role ($r = .26$). The less frequently users went to a library, the higher their ratings of the importance of the Reference Library for business role and the Research Center role, or the more frequently users went to a library, the lower their ratings of the importance of the Reference Library for business role and the Research Center role. The more frequently people went to a library, the higher their rating of the importance of the Public Work Place role.

Whether someone else went to a public library for the respondent. There were five statistically significant differences between respondents who had someone else go to a library for them and respondents who did not (see Table 102). Respondents who had someone else go to a library for them rated the Reference Library for personal information role, the Reference Library for business role, the Community Activities Center role, the Research Center role, and the Public Work Place role higher than respondents who did not. The differences for the Reference Library for business role and the Public Work Place role were trivial.

Whether the respondent called a public library in the last year. There was one statistically significant and non-trivial difference between respondents who called a library for information and those that did not (see Table 103). Respondents who had called a library rated the Reference Library for business lower than respondents who had not called a library for information.

Whether the respondent had made any use of a public library in the past year. There were four statistically significant differences between respondents who had made any use of a library and respondents who had not (see Table 104). Respondents who had made any use of a library rated the Formal Education Support Center role, the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role, the Community Activities Center role, and the Research Center role higher than respondents who had not made use of a library. The differences for the Community Activities Center role and the Research Center role were trivial.

THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE'S OPINION ABOUT AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

The responses to the question about the amount of money that the community should spend on library services were tabulated and are reported in Table 105. These results indicate that 36.5% of the respondents answered that the community should spend between $1 to $20 or per capita on public libraries (this interval contains the national [1990] median of $16.00 per capita), while 44.0% of the respondents answered that the community should spend more than $20 per capita. Nineteen point four per cent of the respondents were not sure and did not respond. The average per capita expenditure[7] that the respondents thought the community should spend annually on the public library was $39.22 - an amount twice as high as the national per capita expenditure.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION AMONG SEGMENTS OF THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

The respondents' opinions about the amount of money that the community should spend for library services was tested for differences among respondents based on the same characteristics of the respondents as were identified on pages 155 and 156. The results of these analyses, reported in Table 106, indicated that there were fifteen statistically significant and non-trivial differences. These differences are reported below.

Region of country Respondents living in the northeastern states and the western states were of the opinion that the community should spend about $51.82 and $43.54 respectively per capita which were higher than the amounts selected by respondents living in the north central states ($14.42) and the south central states ($34.29).

% of community which is Hispanic American. Respondents living in communities with low percentages (less than 11%) were of the opinion that the community should spend about $48.57 per capita which was higher than the amount ($31.76) selected by respondents living in areas with high percentages (over 40%) and higher than the amount ($31.76) selected by respondents in areas with moderate percentages (11% - 40%).

Gender. Males were of the opinion that the community should spend about $47.39 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by females ($31.35).

---

[7] The average or mean of the scores was calculated using the mid-point of each interval; namely, $0, $10, $30, $50, $70, $90, and $110.

Age. The correlation coefficient between the age of the respondents and their opinions about how much money the community should spend was not significant.

Respondents who were 36 to 50 years of age were of the opinion that the community should spend about $47.39 per capita which was higher than the amounts selected by respondents aged 51 to 65 years ($29.00) and over 66 years old ($20.35). Respondents who were 18 to 35 years of age selected $39.15 which was not statistically different than either the high or low amounts selected.

National ancestry. Respondents of Puerto Rican ancestry were of the opinion that the community should spend about $50.88 per capita which was higher than the amounts selected by respondents who considered themselves to Mexican ($33.70) or "Other" Hispanic ancestry ($32.64). Respondents who considered themselves to be Mexican American selected $42.53 per capita which was not statistically different than either the high or low per capita amounts.

Highest grade level completed. The correlation coefficient between the highest grade level completed by the respondents and their opinions about the amount of money the community should spend was not significant.

Respondents who had completed some high school grades were of the opinion that the community should spend about $57.54 per capita which was higher than the amounts selected by respondents who had completed 8th grade or less ($28.18), completed the 12th grade ($37.01), or who had completed some college ($34.59). Respondents who had completed college selected $42.43 per capita which was not statistically different than either the high or low per capita amounts.

Whether, if the respondent had completed the 12th grade or less, the respondent had a high school diploma. Respondents who had a high school diploma were of the opinion that the community should spend about $34.67 per capita which was less than respondents who did not have a high school diploma ($45.49).

Marital status. Respondents who were never married were of the opinion that the community should spend about $47.90 per capita which was higher than the amounts selected by respondents who were married ($35.97) and respondents who were divorced ($32.96).

The number of people living in the home. The correlation coefficient between the number of people living in the home of the respondents and their opinions about the amount of money the community should spend was statistically significant and non-trivial (r = .26). The higher the number of people living in the home, the greater the amount of money the respondents thought the community should provide for library services.

Respondents living in homes with six or more people were of the opinion that the community should spend about $61.03 per capita which was higher than the amounts selected by all other groups; namely, one person ($28.29), two people ($22.79), three people ($40.27), four people ($40.76), and five people ($33.24).

The number of preschool children living in the home. The correlation coefficient between the number of preschool children living in the home of the respondents and their opinions about the amount of money the community should spend was not significant.

Respondents living in homes with one or more preschool children were of the opinion that the community should spend about $53.24 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by respondents living in homes without any preschool children ($35.17).

Principal language spoken at home. Respondents living in homes where English is the principal language were of the opinion that the community should spend about $47.45 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by respondents living in homes where Spanish was the principal language ($28.74).

Total annual household income. The correlation coefficient between the total annual household income of the respondents and their opinions about the amount of money the community should spend was statistically significant and non-trivial (r = .27). The higher the total annual household income, the higher the amount that the respondents thought the community should spend.

Respondents living in households with incomes of $30,000 to $39,999 and in households with incomes of over $40,000 were of the opinions that the public library should receive about $50.06 and $62.41 respectively in per capita support which were higher than the amounts selected by respondents living in households with incomes of less than $10,000 ($32.87), $10,000 to $19,999 ($26.01), and $20,000 - $29,999 ($25.98).

Whether the respondent voted in last (1988) presidential election. Respondents who voted in the last presidential election were of the opinion that the community should spend about $33.61 per capita which was lower than the amount selected by respondents who did not vote ($42.42).

The respondent's opinion about his/her current financial condition. Respondents who felt that they were better off this year than last year were of the opinion that the community should spend about $51.52 per capita which was higher than the amounts selected by respondents who felt that they were worse off this year ($28.94) and by respondents who felt that they were about the same ($35.31).

The respondent's opinion about his/her financial condition next year. Respondents who felt that they will be better off next year were of the opinion that the community should spend about $45.33 per capita which was higher than the amount selected by respondents who felt that they will be worse off next year ($27.00). Respondents who felt that they will be about the same next year selected $32.93 which was not statistically different than the other two groups.

There were no statistically significant differences among the respondents based on whether there were any students in the home, whether the respondent was a student, their employment status, and whether there was a disabled person in the household.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

The respondents' selection of the amount of money that the community should spend for library services was tested for differences among respondents (using analysis of variance) based on the following library use behaviors: whether or not the respondent had gone to a public library in the past year, whether or not someone else had gone to a library to obtain materials for the respondent, whether or not the respondent had called a library for information in the past year, and a constructed measure of any kind of use of a public library - whether or not a respondent answered "yes" to any one of the three "use"questions. The results of these analyses, also reported in Table 107, indicated that there were no statistically significant differences.

The frequency with which library users visited a library was also entered into correlation analysis with the amount of community spending scale. The result of this analysis indicated that there was a statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficient (r = .29) indicating that the more frequently the library users visited a library the higher the amount of money they thought the community should spend for library services.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE ROLES AND THE OPINIONS ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

In order to identify which of the roles of the public library the Hispanic American sample appeared most willing to support financially, each of the role importance scales was entered into a correlation analysis with the amount of community spending scale. Two of these analyses resulted in correlation coefficients that were statistically significant and non-trivial. The ratings of the importance of the Community Information Center role were positively correlated (r = .17) with amount of community spending and the ratings of the Public Work Place were also positively correlated (r = .20) with amount of community spending. The higher the respondents' ratings of the importance of the Community Information Center role and the ratings of the Public Work Place role, the higher the amount of money the respondents thought the community should spend for library services.

TABLE 81
THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE VARIOUS ROLES OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY BY THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

(N = 399)

	$\bar{X}$	%
Independent Learning Center	3.95	95.4
Formal Education Support Center	3.92	93.8
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.91	93.0
Community Information Center	3.81	85.3
Research Center	3.79	84.2
Public Work Place	3.64	74.9
Reference Library - Business	3.62	72.7
Reference Library - Personal	3.52	61.1
Community Activities Center	3.46	61.5
Popular Materials Library	3.46	57.4

Note: N is the sample size and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. % represents the percentage of the sample that rated the role "very important." For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the % of respondents who rated the role "very important."

TABLE 82
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS FROM DIFFERENT REGIONS OF THE COUNTRY*

	Northeast (N = 52)		South Central (N = 130)		North Central (N = 36)		West (N = 181)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	4.00	100.0	3.96	95.9	4.00	100.0	3.85	89.3	.003	.036
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	4.00	100.0	3.93	94.6	3.96	96.4	3.86	89.2	.046	.020
Reference Library - Personal	3.77	80.4	3.53	58.1	3.73	73.4	3.40	55.1	.001	.040
Reference Library - Business	3.95	94.5	3.65	69.2	3.62	66.7	3.51	69.9	.001	.044
Community Activities Center	3.51	50.6	3.51	64.3	3.63	79.2	3.38	59.2	n.s.	
Research Center	3.95	94.8	3.84	87.4	3.87	86.8	3.69	78.3	.007	.030
Community Information Center	3.97	97.0	3.87	90.2	3.80	86.0	3.73	78.3	.004	.033
Independent Learning Center	3.97	97.0	3.95	95.5	3.94	94.2	3.94	95.1	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.57	63.0	3.68	73.0	3.95	95.5	3.56	75.7	.018	.025
Popular Materials Library	3.61	66.4	3.30	49.0	3.73	77.1	3.47	56.3	.005	.033

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{x}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 83
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS FROM COMMUNITIES WITH DIFFERENT PERCENTAGES OF HISPANIC AMERICAN RESIDENTS*

	41% - 100% (N = 94)		11% - 40% (N = 121)		0% - 10% (N = 184)		α	R^2
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%		
Formal Education Support Center	3.95	96.2	3.78	85.7	3.97	97.4	.000	.058
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.89	92.8	3.90	91.1	3.92	94.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.59	67.8	3.50	61.0	3.50	57.8	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.69	77.6	3.71	83.5	3.53	63.7	.038	.017
Community Activities Center	3.42	60.6	3.46	58.8	3.49	63.5	n.s.	
Research Center	3.81	86.2	3.74	86.7	3.81	81.5	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.77	83.9	3.76	82.1	3.87	88.3	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.95	95.9	3.96	95.9	3.94	94.8	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.67	78.7	3.67	71.1	3.60	75.5	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.55	63.9	3.32	50.3	3.50	58.3	.048	.016

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are not statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 84
COMPARISONS BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE RESPONDENTS*

	Male (N = 192)		Female (N = 207)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.92	92.8	3.91	94.7	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.90	91.2	3.92	94.7	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.55	61.5	3.49	60.8	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.65	78.5	3.59	67.0	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.39	58.0	3.53	64.8	n.s.	
Research Center	3.79	81.2	3.79	86.9	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.79	80.2	3.84	90.1	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.93	94.7	3.96	96.0	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.58	74.0	3.69	75.8	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.35	52.5	3.57	62.1	.003	.022

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 85
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS FROM DIFFERENT AGE GROUPS*

	18-35 (N = 194)		36-50 (N = 96)		51-65 (N = 62)		66 and up (N = 41)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.86	90.9	3.99	99.2	3.93	93.2	3.96	96.1	.027	.024
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.91	92.6	3.90	94.9	3.89	89.7	3.95	95.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.49	58.7	3.69	73.8	3.57	61.6	2.97	27.3	.000	.064
Reference Library - Business	3.55	68.2	3.73	80.7	3.55	64.2	3.85	91.1	.040	.022
Community Activities Center	3.55	67.1	3.49	59.9	3.44	56.8	2.75	35.1	.000	.066
Research Center	3.71	80.3	3.83	84.9	3.84	85.7	3.99	98.7	.019	.025
Community Information Center	3.79	84.7	3.84	86.9	3.91	91.4	3.76	75.8	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.96	96.1	3.94	94.5	3.89	92.8	4.00	100.0	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.70	77.2	3.73	78.7	3.51	63.7	3.26	66.9	.001	.040
Popular Materials Library	3.34	52.8	3.65	69.3	3.52	52.7	3.39	50.0	.005	.033

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 86
COMPARISONS AMONG HISPANIC AMERICANS BASED ON ORIGIN*

	Mexican (N = 129)		Mexican-American (N = 140)		Puerto Rican (N = 47)		Other (N = 80)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.95	95.3	3.93	94.1	3.71	85.4	3.97	96.8	.000	.051
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.92	93.3	3.93	93.6	4.00	100.0	3.84	89.9	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.45	55.3	3.57	61.9	3.77	77.3	3.41	61.1	.016	.027
Reference Library - Business	3.66	69.3	3.59	74.5	3.60	74.9	3.65	74.0	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.45	64.2	3.53	68.9	3.28	42.6	3.51	57.5	n.s.	
Research Center	3.85	87.3	3.80	81.8	3.56	85.4	3.80	82.8	.023	.024
Community Information Center	3.80	83.1	3.82	85.3	3.71	85.4	3.88	89.6	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.97	97.3	3.91	92.7	4.00	100.0	3.93	94.1	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.58	74.2	3.74	79.3	3.71	74.7	3.53	69.3	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.45	58.2	3.45	58.0	3.58	57.7	3.45	55.2	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

Hispanic American Sample

TABLE 87
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON HIGHEST GRADE LEVEL COMPLETED*

	8th grade or less (N = 99)		9th - 11th grade (N = 74)		12th grade (N = 122)		Some college (N = 60)		Completed college (N = 36)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.78	85.5	3.97	96.8	3.95	96.3	3.97	96.8	3.93	93.2	.001	.046
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.93	93.2	4.00	100.0	3.84	89.7	3.91	91.8	3.88	90.7	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.57	66.5	3.51	52.5	3.56	67.0	3.59	61.9	3.08	39.4	.002	.044
Reference Library - Business	3.58	68.3	3.66	82.3	3.67	79.1	3.57	60.6	3.47	57.5	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.20	51.00	3.86	89.6	3.35	52.6	3.56	63.6	3.42	49.2	.000	.081
Research Center	3.72	88.0	3.76	76.6	3.86	88.3	3.83	84.7	3.69	71.6	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.72	79.3	3.91	93.0	3.78	83.5	3.88	88.6	3.84	84.4	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.98	97.9	4.00	100.0	3.93	93.6	3.91	91.3	3.84	90.8	.022	.029
Public Work Place	3.55	72.8	3.83	86.1	3.58	71.1	3.71	80.5	3.49	57.4	.050	.024
Popular Materials Library	3.24	48.1	3.56	62.4	3.54	62.5	3.47	54.8	3.41	48.9	.033	.027

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 88
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON AWARD OF HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA*

	High school diploma (N = 137)		No high school diploma (N = 160)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.88	93.1	3.92	93.1	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.88	92.3	3.94	94.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.61	68.6	3.51	58.2	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.65	78.9	3.64	74.9	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.34	53.5	3.52	69.6	n.s.	
Research Center	3.73	84.2	3.84	86.3	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.73	81.4	3.86	87.4	.032	.015
Independent Learning Center	3.94	95.0	3.98	98.2	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.62	73.4	3.66	77.6	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.55	62.0	3.37	54.7	.041	.015

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{x}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

Hispanic American Sample

TABLE 89
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON MARITAL STATUS*

	Married (N = 224)		Divorced (N = 36)		Never married (N = 107)		α	R^2
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%		
Formal Education Support Center	3.90	92.9	4.00	1.00	3.90	91.8	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.90	92.7	3.93	94.5	3.90	91.1	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.61	66.7	3.73	73.4	3.30	45.3	.000	.056
Reference Library - Business	3.66	74.8	3.69	75.8	3.44	60.6	.021	.022
Community Activities Center	3.35	57.0	3.42	54.2	3.60	66.7	.030	.020
Research Center	3.78	86.0	3.81	82.3	3.74	76.2	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.77	83.2	3.75	78.9	3.86	87.8	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.94	95.5	3.88	89.3	3.95	95.9	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.66	78.7	3.51	60.6	3.60	68.8	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.48	57.0	3.59	63.8	3.22	43.2	.005	.030

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 90
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN THE HOME*

	1 (N = 25)		2 (N = 92)		3 (N = 79)		4 (N = 81)		5 (N = 43)		6 or more (N = 64)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.92	91.6	3.81	89.2	3.95	95.8	3.96	96.4	3.91	91.5	3.94	94.9	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.91	90.7	3.84	89.7	3.88	88.9	3.98	98.4	3.90	93.9	3.94	95.2	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.62	64.2	3.37	56.1	3.49	55.8	3.50	52.6	3.38	42.3	3.73	87.1	.033	.033
Reference Library - Business	3.43	53.9	3.46	66.7	3.70	75.9	3.40	58.1	3.69	74.6	3.94	94.3	.000	.079
Community Activities Center	3.47	54.2	2.99	42.0	3.62	67.4	3.44	58.5	3.62	73.5	3.67	69.7	.000	.098
Research Center	3.76	80.8	3.66	81.7	3.77	80.8	3.75	76.9	3.86	86.7	3.96	97.1	.034	.031
Community Information Center	3.79	79.0	3.65	73.2	3.86	90.5	3.85	88.8	3.86	87.9	3.89	90.1	.017	.036
Independent Learning Center	3.72	80.8	3.95	95.3	3.94	95.2	3.94	94.3	3.99	99.7	3.99	99.0	.001	.052
Public Work Place	3.48	64.4	3.29	59.6	3.75	81.3	3.71	74.6	3.74	75.3	3.83	87.9	.000	.082
Popular Materials Library	3.47	61.4	3.38	44.6	3.26	49.3	3.45	49.0	3.44	55.9	3.72	85.3	.016	.037

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 91
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON NUMBER OF PRESCHOOLERS IN THE HOME[*]

	No preschoolers in the home (N = 259)		1 or more preschoolers in the home (N = 100)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.89	92.3	3.97	97.3	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.89	91.5	3.94	96.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.48	57.8	3.54	62.8	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.54	69.0	3.80	82.5	.002	.029
Community Activities Center	3.37	57.4	3.61	68.3	.015	.017
Research Center	3.73	80.4	3.90	92.4	.011	.018
Community Information Center	3.78	83.8	3.87	89.3	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.96	96.3	3.95	95.9	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.57	69.6	3.80	87.7	.007	.020
Popular Materials Library	3.35	47.2	3.65	76.4	.001	.033

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 92
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN THE HOME[*]

	No students in the home (N = 183)		1 or more students in the home (N = 174)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.95	95.2	3.88	92.2	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.87	90.2	3.94	95.8	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.32	46.7	3.66	71.4	.000	.059
Reference Library - Business	3.56	71.1	3.67	74.5	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.34	55.9	3.54	65.1	.024	.015
Research Center	3.78	80.3	3.78	87.3	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.81	84.1	3.81	86.6	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.96	96.2	3.96	96.3	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.55	71.4	3.72	78.0	.026	.014
Popular Materials Library	3.42	52.3	3.46	58.6	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 93
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO ARE STUDENTS AND RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOT*

	Students (N = 74)		Non-students (N = 309)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.92	92.9	3.91	93.7	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.91	94.5	3.90	92.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.51	57.3	3.50	60.1	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.42	59.0	3.65	74.7	.009	.018
Community Activities Center	3.74	75.7	3.37	55.9	.000	.034
Research Center	3.71	72.1	3.80	86.3	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.88	89.9	3.79	83.5	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.98	98.1	3.94	94.5	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.69	77.8	3.61	73.0	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.25	47.1	3.48	57.8	.017	.015

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 94
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON PRIMARY LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME[*]

	English (N = 203)		Spanish (N = 181)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.96	96.2	3.86	90.3	.008	.020
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.90	92.5	3.91	93.0	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.43	53.8	3.59	66.6	.032	.013
Reference Library - Business	3.53	68.2	3.70	75.9	.020	.015
Community Activities Center	3.33	53.3	3.57	67.9	.003	.024
Research Center	3.79	80.4	3.77	87.0	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.81	83.7	3.80	85.9	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.94	94.7	3.95	95.7	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.52	69.7	3.75	78.9	.002	.026
Popular Materials Library	3.35	48.3	3.56	65.8	.007	.020

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 95
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS WITH DIFFERENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS[*]

	Employed full time (N = 199)		Employed part time (N = 45)		Unemployed (N = 30)		Retired (N = 42)		Not in work force (N = 68)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.97	97.1	3.61	78.9	3.87	90.0	3.89	88.6	3.97	96.8	.000	.116
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.90	93.1	3.97	97.0	3.77	85.8	3.85	86.4	3.96	96.1	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.53	61.1	3.61	67.6	3.31	50.0	3.00	28.5	3.67	68.1	.000	.068
Reference Library - Business	3.60	71.1	3.43	64.0	3.52	70.1	3.82	89.1	3.67	71.1	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.49	59.4	3.46	65.6	3.52	65.0	2.73	30.8	3.57	68.7	.000	.076
Research Center	3.81	82.5	3.43	74.3	3.67	72.0	3.93	96.6	3.90	90.3	.000	.070
Community Information Center	3.85	86.7	3.64	79.1	3.73	78.5	3.69	72.9	3.91	93.1	.013	.034
Independent Learning Center	3.94	94.1	4.00	99.6	3.82	89.6	3.92	92.1	4.00	1.00	.017	.032
Public Work Place	3.63	71.9	3.80	84.8	3.42	67.5	3.39	77.5	3.73	73.4	.022	.031
Popular Materials Library	3.38	52.6	3.51	57.8	3.46	61.6	3.46	56.7	3.55	60.6	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 96

COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS WITH DIFFERENT ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME[*]

	Less than $10,000 (N = 62)		$10,000-$19,999 (N = 85)		$20,000-$29,999 (N = 66)		$30,000-$39,999 (N = 52)		$40,000 or more (N = 69)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.73	86.6	3.97	96.6	3.96	95.7	3.96	97.1	3.93	92.8	.002	.053
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.97	98.0	3.92	93.1	3.92	94.1	3.92	94.6	3.78	83.9	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.79	83.8	3.54	57.4	3.52	56.7	3.55	72.8	3.27	45.8	.002	.053
Reference Library - Business	3.53	75.3	3.85	86.3	3.57	62.9	3.88	89.1	3.25	54.5	.000	.117
Community Activities Center	3.36	65.8	3.54	75.8	3.60	69.4	3.36	47.6	3.40	49.0	n.s.	
Research Center	3.58	81.4	3.88	89.8	3.84	85.9	3.91	90.7	3.60	62.4	.001	.059
Community Information Center	3.72	84.1	3.79	80.9	3.89	90.5	3.77	83.6	3.84	84.1	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	4.00	1.00	3.94	93.8	3.95	95.5	3.89	89.1	3.91	95.1	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.86	91.8	3.51	75.2	3.64	68.0	3.74	78.0	3.56	67.0	.028	.032
Popular Materials Library	3.56	61.7	3.34	57.7	3.64	65.9	3.64	70.9	3.23	36.2	.002	.052

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 97
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO LIVE IN HOUSEHOLDS WITH INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE DISABILITIES AND RESPONDENTS WHO DO NOT*

	Disabilities (N = 53)		No disabilities (N = 328)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	4.00	1.00	3.90	92.4	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	4.00	1.00	3.89	91.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.72	75.3	3.47	57.2	.014	.016
Reference Library - Business	3.76	85.9	3.58	69.6	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.04	45.9	3.51	62.2	.000	.043
Research Center	3.93	94.9	3.76	82.2	.043	.011
Community Information Center	3.81	81.1	3.81	85.6	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	4.00	1.00	3.94	94.7	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.44	78.5	3.65	73.0	.050	.010
Popular Materials Library	3.67	70.4	3.40	52.9	.014	.016

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 98
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO VOTED AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT VOTE IN THE 1988 ELECTION*

	Voted (N = 144)		Did not vote (N = 244)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.96	96.3	3.89	92.3	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.88	91.2	3.93	94.1	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.34	48.3	3.64	69.0	.000	.044
Reference Library - Business	3.52	63.5	3.69	78.3	.017	.015
Community Activities Center	3.22	46.5	3.61	70.5	.000	.058
Research Center	3.80	82.6	3.78	84.6	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.78	81.0	3.83	87.5	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.92	93.4	3.96	96.3	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.39	61.3	3.77	82.0	.000	.067
Popular Materials Library	3.37	47.2	3.52	63.6	.047	.010

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 99
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON PERSONAL FINANCIAL SITUATION COMPARED TO LAST YEAR*

	Better off (N = 102)		Worse off (N = 96)		About the same (N = 188)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.97	97.4	3.73	82.4	3.97	96.6	.000	.082
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.94	95.4	3.88	88.8	3.90	93.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.56	62.3	3.57	63.9	3.45	57.0	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.60	74.8	3.53	68.9	3.65	71.7	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.57	69.1	3.29	53.1	3.45	58.5	n.s.	
Research Center	3.77	79.2	3.69	83.8	3.84	86.1	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.82	84.6	3.68	78.7	3.87	88.4	.009	.025
Independent Learning Center	3.92	93.0	3.93	95.0	3.96	96.6	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.69	76.1	3.71	79.0	3.55	70.8	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.27	49.2	3.41	55.9	3.55	59.8	.007	.027

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 100
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BASED ON PERSONAL FINANCIAL SITUATION EXPECTED FOR NEXT YEAR*

	Better off (N = 200)		Worse off (N = 28)		About the same (N = 114)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.88	92.3	3.96	95.9	3.94	94.7	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.95	95.3	3.95	95.5	3.81	86.8	.009	.029
Reference Library - Personal	3.57	65.0	3.41	43.2	3.50	55.8	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.70	77.7	3.35	46.6	3.45	64.3	.002	.038
Community Activities Center	3.48	62.0	3.25	37.3	3.56	67.1	n.s.	
Research Center	3.76	84.5	3.87	92.3	3.74	76.0	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.78	83.6	3.88	87.5	3.85	89.7	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.96	96.1	3.98	98.8	3.89	91.1	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.74	80.1	3.33	45.5	3.60	69.9	.003	.034
Popular Materials Library	3.42	58.5	3.15	33.7	3.51	55.8	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 101
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO VISITED AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT VISIT THE PUBLIC LIBRARY IN THE LAST YEAR*

	Visited library (N = 207)		Did not visit library (N = 192)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.97	97.5	3.85	89.5	.001	.027
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.97	97.6	3.85	88.1	.001	.027
Reference Library - Personal	3.49	58.4	3.56	64.1	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.57	66.6	3.68	79.6	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.52	66.7	3.40	55.6	n.s.	
Research Center	3.83	84.2	3.75	84.1	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.84	86.9	3.79	83.6	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.97	97.2	3.92	93.4	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.60	73.6	3.68	76.3	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.43	52.4	3.50	62.9	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 102
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS BASED ON WHETHER SOMEONE ELSE WENT TO THE PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR THEM IN THE LAST YEAR*

	Yes (N = 89)		No (N = 309)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.98	97.8	3.90	92.6	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.96	96.8	3.89	91.9	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.75	81.8	3.45	54.9	.000	.033
Reference Library - Business	3.77	81.5	3.57	70.0	.016	.015
Community Activities Center	3.71	80.2	3.39	56.2	.001	.030
Research Center	3.95	95.2	3.75	81.1	.003	.023
Community Information Center	3.87	88.5	3.80	834.4	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.98	99.0	3.94	94.4	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.77	86.5	3.61	72.0	.050	.009
Popular Materials Library	3.51	67.8	3.45	54.6	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 103
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO CALLED THE PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR INFORMATION IN THE LAST YEAR AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT*

	Called library (N = 80)		Did not call library (N = 318)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.97	96.7	3.90	93.0	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.94	95.0	3.90	92.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.54	57.3	3.51	62.0	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.25	46.7	3.72	79.9	.000	.077
Community Activities Center	3.56	67.1	3.44	60.3	n.s.	
Research Center	3.77	78.4	3.79	85.6	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.83	88.8	3.81	84.9	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.90	92.4	3.96	96.1	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.68	76.6	3.63	74.4	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.51	51.0	3.45	59.3	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 104
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO IN ANY WAY USED THE PUBLIC LIBRARY IN THE LAST YEAR AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT*

	Users (N = 246)		Non-users (N = 154)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.96	96.4	3.84	89.4	.001	.027
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.96	96.4	3.84	87.8	.001	.026
Reference Library - Personal	3.52	61.2	3.52	61.1	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.61	70.1	3.64	77.1	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.53	68.1	3.35	50.3	.025	.013
Research Center	3.84	85.5	3.71	82.1	.020	.013
Community Information Center	3.85	87.5	3.76	82.1	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.95	96.5	3.93	93.6	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.63	75.4	3.65	74.2	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.48	56.1	3.43	59.5	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 105
HISPANIC AMERICANS' OPINIONS ABOUT LEVELS OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARY SERVICES

Amount	Frequency	Percent	Adjusted Percent*
$ 0	0	0.0	0.0
$ 1 - $20	146	36.5	45.3
$21 - $40	74	18.6	23.1
$41 - $60	21	5.3	6.6
$61 - $80	22	5.6	7.0
$81 - $100	3	.8	1.0
$101 -	55	13.7	17.0
Don't Know	78	19.4	Missing
Total	399		

---

*Note: Percentages recalculated with missing respondents excluded.

TABLE 106
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	C.I.
Entire Sample	321	$39.26	$35.21 - $43.30

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Region of country			.000	.071	
Northeast	50	$51.82			$40.30 - $63.35
South Central	103	$34.29			$28.42 - $40.16
North Central	29	$14.42			$10.37 - $18.46
West	138	$43.54			$36.72 - $50.35
% of community which is Hispanic			.000	.054	
Over 40%	84	$31.76			$24.92 - $38.60
11% - 40%	93	$31.76			$25.36 - $38.17
Less than 11%	143	$48.57			$41.79 - $55.35
Gender			.000	.051	
Males	153	$47.96			$41.61 - $54.31
Females	169	$31.35			$26.53 - $36.15
Age			.016	.032	
18 - 35	180	$39.15			$33.83 - $44.47
36 - 50	85	$47.39			$38.26 - $56.52
51 - 65	41	$29.00			$21.03 - $36.99
66 and up	11	$20.35			$ 6.77 - $33.93

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 106 (continued)
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Race/Ethnicity			.021	.030	
Mexican	87	$33.70			$26.69 - $40.71
Mexican American	119	$42.53			$35.42 - $49.63
Puerto Rican	47	$50.88			$38.37 - $63.39
Other	66	$32.64			$24.96 - $40.34
Highest grade level completed			.000	.068	
8th grade or less	59	$28.18			$21.62 - $34.73
9th - 11th grade	60	$57.54			$45.47 - $69.60
12th grade	111	$37.01			$29.98 - $44.04
Some college	56	$34.59			$26.89 - $42.30
Completed college	31	$42.43			$30.22 - $54.65
High school diploma or equivalent			.034	.020	
Yes	118	$34.67			$28.19 - $41.15
No	115	$45.49			$37.91 - $53.07
Marital status			.020	.025	
Married	182	$35.97			$30.93 - $41.01
Divorced	29	$32.96			$22.04 - $43.88
Never married	99	$47.90			$38.64 - $56.16

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 106 (continued)
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
# of people living in household			.000	.115	
one	19	$28.29			$13.08 - $43.49
two	65	$22.79			$16.65 - $28.92
three	77	$40.27			$33.32 - $47.21
four	66	$40.76			$31.78 - $49.74
five	31	$33.24			$20.11 - $46.38
six or more	59	$61.03			$49.03 - $73.02
# of preschool children in the home			.000	.047	
No preschoolers	220	$35.17			$30.51 - $39.83
One or more preschoolers	79	$53.24			$44.49 - $62.00
# of students in the home			n.s.	--	
No students	143	$42.93			$36.35 - $49.50
One or more students	156	$37.18			$31.78 - $42.58
Respondents who are students			n.s.	--	
Students	69	$44.33			$35.03 - $53.63
Non-students	251	$37.69			$33.23 - $42.15

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 106 (continued)
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Employment status			n.s.	--	
Employed full time	180	$41.12			$35.64 - $46.60
Employed part time	40	$36.36			$25.00 - $47.71
Unemployed	25	$39.70			$25.24 - $54.16
Retired	12	$23.26			$11.38 - $35.13
Not in work force	61	$38.58			$28.46 - $48.69
Annual household income			.000	.163	
Less than $10,000	50	$32.87			$22.64 - $43.09
$10,000 - $19,999	60	$26.01			$18.23 - $33.79
$20,000 - $29,999	60	$25.98			$20.26 - $31.74
$30,000 - $39,999	40	$50.06			$38.14 - $62.00
$40,000 or more	68	$62.41			$52.00 - $72.81
Disabled person in household			n.s.	--	
Yes	45	$48.37			$35.11 - $61.63
No	275	$37.67			$33.52 - $41.82
Voted in '88 election			.040	.013	
Yes	116	$33.61			$27.92 - $39.30
No	206	$42.42			$37.03 - $74.81

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 106 (continued)
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Current financial situation			.000	.057	
Better off than last year	92	$51.52			$42.82 - $60.22
Worse off than last year	66	$28.94			$21.93 - $35.95
About the same	154	$35.31			$29.71 - $40.90
Future financial situation			.005	.036	
Better off next year	177	$45.33			$29.32 - $51.33
Worse off next year	26	$27.01			$20.67 - $33.36
About the same	102	$32.93			$26.45 - $39.41
Primary language spoken in household			.000	.066	
English	178	$47.45			$41.40 - $53.50
Spanish	136	$28.74			$23.94 - $33.55

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 107
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES BETWEEN LIBRARY USERS AND NON-USERS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	C.I.
Entire Sample	321	$39.26	$35.21 - $43.30

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Respondent went to public library last year			n.s.	--	
Yes	180	$38.94			$33.82 - $44.06
No	141	$39.75			$33.27 - $46.23
Someone else went to library for respondent			n.s.	--	
Yes	78	$39.43			$30.96 - $49.90
No	243	$39.33			$34.72 - $43.94
Respondent called library for information			n.s.	--	
Yes	73	$44.22			$35.18 - $53.26
No	248	$37.79			$33.31 - $42.27
Respondent used library in any way last year			n.s.	--	
Yes	214	$40.26			$35.35 - $45.17
No	108	$37.27			$30.20 - $44.34

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 155. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

PART V. THE OPINION LEADERS SURVEY

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE

Opinion leaders are defined as those individuals who, having attained positions of authority, responsibility, and leadership in society, are believed to be in a position to reflect the prevailing opinions of leaders in society and to affect public opinion about key issues. The opinion leaders sample included 300 respondents - 75 local political leaders, 75 leaders of media organizations, 75 educational leaders, and 75 leaders of businesses, professional associations and other kinds of organizations. Each quota sample of opinion leaders was selected by the Gallup Organization from organizations representative of the four groups of opinion leaders. It should be noted that this sample of opinion leaders is not purported to be representative of the national population of opinion leaders nor are the sub-samples purported to be representative of their respective referent groups. Consequently, the comparative data presented in this report can only be viewed as illustrative.

All of the demographic characteristics of the opinion leaders sample[1] are presented in the Appendix. Five key demographic characteristics, which are considerably different from those of the national sample, are presented below. In analyzing the opinion leaders' evaluations of the roles and in comparing their evaluations to those of the other samples, the reader should keep these differences in mind.

Region of country[2]	12.0%	northeast
	34.7%	south central
	27.0%	north central
	26.0%	west
	.3%	missing

---

[1] The frequency distributions for the responses to all the questions in the interview are presented in the Appendix for this report. The Appendix is a separately bound publication.

When the analysis of the opinion leaders file was begun, it was discovered that data identifying the size of the community in which the respondent lived, and the gender of the respondents had not been obtained. The project director at the Gallup Organization suspects that these data were not gathered by the manager of the survey either because of the small size of the sample or because the sample was not a probability sample.

[2] These regional areas are defined by The Gallup Organization as follows: northeast states = Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont; south central states = Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Washington D.C., Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia; north central states = Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin; western states = Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

Age	16.1%	18 - 35 years
	52.0%	36 - 50 years
	27.3%	51 - 65 years
	4.0%	66 years and older
	.7%	missing
Hispanic origin	1.7%	Hispanic
	98.0%	Non-Hispanic
	.3%	missing
Race	92.3%	Caucasian
	4.3%	African American
	.7%	Native American
	.7%	Asian Pacific Islanders
	1.0%	Other
	1.0%	missing
Highest grade level completed	.3%	8th grade or less
	.7%	9th - 11th grade
	7.3%	12th grade
	11.3%	some college
	1.0%	associate degree
	33.3%	bachelor's degree
	26.7%	master's degree
	7.7%	professional degree
	10.0%	doctoral degree
	1.6%	missing
Household income	.3%	less than $5,000
	1.0%	$ 5,000 - $ 9,999
	1.3%	$10,000 - $14,999
	2.3%	$15,000 - $19,999
	1.7%	$20,000 - $24,999
	4.7%	$25,000 - $29,999
	3.0%	$30,000 - $34,999
	4.7%	$35,000 - $39,999
	8.3%	$40,000 - $44,999
	6.0%	$45,000 - $49,999
	7.3%	$50,000 - $54,999
	4.0%	$55,000 - $59,999
(Median interval)	6.0%	$60,000 - $64,999
	3.0%	$65,000 - $69,999
	5.7%	$70,000 - $74,999
	31.7%	$75,000 or more
	9.0%	missing

As these data demonstrate, the opinion leaders in the sample were

> older (79.3% of the opinion leaders were in the prime work years of 36-65 compared to only 43.3% of the national sample),
>
> much better educated (77.7% of the opinion leaders were college graduates compared to only 22.2% of the national sample),
>
> much more affluent (the median household income interval for the opinion leaders was $60,000 - $64,999 compared to only $35,000 - $39,999 for the national sample), and
>
> less diverse (6.8% of the opinion leaders were non-Caucasian compared to 13.2% of the national sample).

LIBRARY USE AMONG THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE

The opinion leaders were much heavier users of the public library than the national probability sample. The data indicated that 83.3% of the opinion leaders reported that they had personally gone to a public library in the last year (compared to 57.1% of the national sample), 52.0% of the opinion leaders reported that someone else had obtained materials for them (compared to 21.4% of the national sample), and 58.3% of the opinion leaders reported that they had called a library for information (compared to 23.1% of the national sample). Controlling for overlap among these activities, it was determined that 91.0% of the opinion leaders had in some way used a public library in the last year (compared to 63.3% of the national sample).

EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE

The responses to the role evaluation questions were analyzed in two ways: first, mean scores for the role importance scales were calculated; and second, the percentages of respondents who for each role selected the category "very important" were tabulated. While the mean importance scale score yields a more precise estimate of the respondents' evaluations of the importance of a role, the percentage of respondents who selected the category "very important" is the more easily understood and communicated estimate of the importance of a role. All of the tables presenting results of role evaluations present both the mean scale scores and the percentage "scores."

The results of the role evaluations are reported in Table 108 in ranked order from the role receiving the highest mean importance scale score to the role receiving the lowest mean importance scale score. These results can be interpreted in two ways: first, the scores for any given role can be interpreted in terms of their position or standing on the four-point importance scale (an absolute assessment); and second, the scores for any given role can be interpreted in terms of their ranking relative to the scores received by the other roles (a relative assessment). For example, more than half of the sample (52.7%) rated the Popular Materials Library role as "very important" with a mean score of 3.41, but this rating places the role in fifth position of

331

importance compared to the other roles. The reader should note that the ranking by mean score is not the same as the ranking by the percentage "score." The reader should also note that the distance between the mean scores for some of the roles is quite small indicating that, while one role is ranked higher or lower than another role, for all practical purposes the roles are about equal in importance. The same observation could also be made for the percentage "scores."

The results in Table 108 indicate that a majority of the opinion leaders sample considered six out of the ten roles to be "very important." Of these, however, the Formal Education Support Center role, the Preschoolers' Door to Learning role, and the Independent Learning Center role received the highest ratings of importance strongly suggesting that the opinion leaders sample considered the public library's role of supporting the educational aspirations of the community to be its most important role.

In evaluating these results the reader should also keep in mind some of the anomalies in the role statements and the public's interpretations of the role statements that were discussed on pages 17-19.

DIFFERENCES IN THE ROLE EVALUATIONS BY THE FOUR OPINION LEADER GROUPS

Each of the role importance scales was tested for differences among the four opinion leaders groups using analysis of variance.[3] The results of these analyses, reported in Table 109, indicate that there were statistically significant and non-trivial differences among the group evaluations of the Formal Education Support Center role, the Reference Library for business role, the Research Center role, the Community Information Center role, the Independent Learning Center role, and the Public Work Place role. Comparisons among groups indicated that the Educational Leaders group rated the importance of the Formal Education Support Center role, the Reference Library for Business role, the Research Center role, and the Community Information Center role lower than the other opinion leaders groups. The Media Leaders group rated the Public Work Place role lower than did the Political Leaders group.

---

[3] Analysis of variance is a statistical procedure for testing whether the observed differences among group means for each role evaluation occurred by chance or because the groups differed in their evaluations of the importance of the role. A statistically significant difference among the group means is defined as one whose probability of occurring by chance (the α level reported in the tables) is so low that we choose to conclude that the difference did not occur by chance but that it occurred because the groups differed in their evaluation of the role. All differences with an α level of .05 or less (that is, the probability that the difference occurred by chance is 5 out of a hundred or less) are considered to be statistically significant. The α levels for all statistically significant differences are reported in the tables. All differences with an α level greater than .05 (that is, the probability that the difference occurred by chance is greater than 5 out of a hundred) are considered to be non-significant and are designated as such in the table with the initials n.s.

A non-trivial difference is defined as a statistically significant difference whose magnitude of difference is sufficiently large that it warrants attention for possible usefulness in managerial decision making. By contrast, a trivial difference is defined as a statistically significant difference whose magnitude of difference is so small or trivial as to be of questionable value in managerial decision making. Deciding whether a statistically significant difference is trivial or non-trivial is a judgement call. We have adopted the rule that if R^2, the coefficient of determination, is equal to or greater than .02 the difference is considered to be non-trivial. The coefficient of determination measures the amount of variation in the role evaluation scores that is explained by the group differences - the larger the coefficient of determination, the more meaningful the difference. The coefficients of determination for all statistically significant differences are reported in the tables so assessments about triviality can be made.

These results indicate that the Education Leaders group systematically rated the library roles in the community lower in importance than the other opinion leader groups on five of the role scales; most notably, for the educational support roles of the Formal Education Support Center, the Research Center, and the Independent Learning Center.

DIFFERENCES IN THE ROLE EVALUATIONS OF OPINION LEADERS FROM DIFFERENT REGIONS OF THE COUNTRY

Each of the role importance scales was tested for differences among the groups of opinion leaders from the four regions of the country (using analysis of variance). The results of these analyses, reported in Table 110, indicate that there were two statistically significant and non-trivial differences among the group evaluations of the Community Information Center Role and Independent Learning Center role. Comparisons among groups indicated that the opinion leaders from the north central states rated the importance of both the Community Information Center role and the Independent Learning Center role lower than opinion leaders from the south central and northeast states.

DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ROLES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE

Each of the role importance scales was tested for differences among the opinion leaders (using analysis of variance) based on the following library use behaviors: whether or not the opinion leader had gone to a public library in the past year, whether or not someone else had gone to a library to obtain materials for the opinion leader, whether or not the opinion leader had called a library for information in the past year, and a constructed measure of any kind of use of a public library - whether or not an opinion leader answered "yes" to any one of the three "use" questions. The results of these analyses, reported in Tables 111 - 114, indicated that there were four statistically significant differences.

Opinion leaders who did not go to a library in the last year rated the Research Center role and the Popular Materials Library role higher than did opinion leaders who had gone to a library in the last year (see Table 111). Both of these differences, however, were trivial.

Respondents who indicated that they had gone to a library in the past year were also asked how many times they had gone to a library and were provided six numerical response categories which were converted into a six-point scale. This frequency of visit scale was also entered into correlation analyses[4] with each of the role importance scales. The results of these analyses indicated no statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficients.

There were no differences between opinion leaders who had someone else go to a library for them and opinion leaders who did not (see Table 112).

Opinion leaders who did not call a library for information rated the Public Work Place role higher than opinion leaders who did call a library for information (see Table 113). This difference was trivial.

Opinion leaders who had not made any use of a library in the past year rated the Public Work Place role higher than opinion leaders who had made use of a library (see Table 114).

These results indicate that opinion leaders who used a public library and opinion leaders who did not use a public library in the past year tended to share the same assessments of the importance of the various roles of the public library in the community.

THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE'S OPINION ABOUT AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

The responses to the question about the amount of money that the community should spend on library services were tabulated and are reported in Table 115. These results indicate that 19.3% of the opinion leaders answered that the community should spend between $1 to $20 per capita on public libraries (this interval contains the national [1990] median of $16.00 per capita) and that 71.4% of the opinion leaders answered that the community should spend more than $20 per capita. Nine per cent of the opinion leaders were not sure and did not respond and .3% of the opinion leaders thought that the public library should not receive any public financial support. The average per capita expenditure[5] that the opinion leaders thought the community should spend annually on the public library was $40.95 - an amount two and a half times as high as the national per capita expenditure.

---

[4] A correlation coefficient is an index of the strength of the relationship between two quantitative variables. The coefficient can take a value from -1.00 (indicating a perfect inverse relationship) to 0.00 (indicating the absence of any relationship) to +1.00 (indicating a perfect positive relationship). Typically, correlation coefficients appear either as a negative decimal value (indicating that high scores for one variable are associated with low scores for the other variable) or as a positive decimal value (indicating that high scores for one variable are associated with high scores for the other variable). The higher the decimal value, the stronger the relationship.

A statistically significant relationship is defined as one whose probability of occurrence by chance is so low that we choose to conclude that it did not occur by chance but that it occurred because the two variables are related. A non-trivial relationship is defined as a statistically significant relationship of sufficient strength that it warrants attention for possible usefulness in managerial decision making. In this report, correlation coefficients equal to or greater than ±.15 are considered to be non-trivial.

[5] The average or mean of the scores was calculated using the mid-point of each interval; namely, $0, $10, $30, $50, $70, $90, and $110.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION AMONG THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Opinions about the amount of community per capita spending for library services were tested for differences among the opinion leaders grouped by leadership group and region of country. The result of these analyses, reported in Table 116, indicated that there were no statistically significant differences among the groups.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES BY LIBRARY USERS AND NONUSERS IN THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE

Opinions about the amount of community per capita spending for library services were tested for differences among the opinion leaders grouped by whether or not they used a public library. The result of these analyses, reported in Table 117, indicated that there was only one statistically significant difference. Opinion Leaders who called a library for information thought that the community should spend significantly more per capita ($44.26) than opinion leaders who did not call a library ($34.63).

Those opinion leaders who indicated that they had gone to a library in the past year were also asked how frequently they had gone to a library and were provided a six-point numeric scale with which to estimate their frequency of visits. The frequency of visit scale was entered into a correlation analysis with the amount of community per capita spending scale. The result of this analysis indicated that there was a statistically significant and non-trivial correlation coefficient ($r = .18$) suggesting that, among opinion leaders who visited a library in the past year, the more frequently the opinion leader visited a library the higher the per capita amount they thought the community should spend for library services.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE EVALUATIONS OF THE ROLES AND THE OPINIONS ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE

In order to identify which roles of the public library were most highly related to the amount of financial support the opinion leaders thought the community should provide, each of the role importance scales was entered into a correlation analysis with the amount of public spending scale. These analyses resulted in five correlation coefficients that were statistically significant and non-trivial. These results, reported in the first column of Table 118, indicate that the higher the rating of the importance of the Community Activities Center role ($r = .22$), the Formal Education Support Center role ($r = .20$), the Community Information Center role ($r = .17$), the Public Work Place role ($r = .17$), and the Research Center role ($r = .16$) the higher the amount of money that the opinion leaders thought the community should spend on public library services.

These correlation analyses were also conducted for each of the four opinion leader groups. The results of these analyses, also reported in Table 118, indicate the following:

among political opinion leaders the higher the ratings of the importance of the Community Activities Center role, the Public Work Place role, and the Research Center role, the higher the amount of money that the opinion leaders thought the community should spend for public library services;

among opinion leaders from the media the higher the ratings of the importance of the Reference Library for Business role and the Independent Learning Center role, the higher the amount of money that the opinion leaders thought the community should spend for public library services;

among educational opinion leaders the higher the ratings of the importance of the Formal Education Support Center role, the Community Information Center role, and the Business Reference Library role, the higher the amount of money that the opinion leaders thought the community should spend for public library services;

among business opinion leaders the higher the ratings of the importance of the Research Center role and the Community Activities Center role, the higher the amount of money that the opinion leaders thought the community should spend for public library services.

COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE ROLE EVALUATIONS OF THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE AND THE NATIONAL SAMPLE

Each of the role importance scales was tested for differences between the opinion leaders sample and the national sample using analysis of variance. The results of these analyses, reported in Table 119, indicated that there were four statistically significant but trivial differences between the two groups on their evaluations of the Reference Library role for personal information, the Research Center role, the Independent Learning Center role, and the Public Work Place role. For each of these roles, the opinions leaders rated the importance of the role lower than did the members of the national sample. However, these differences are trivial.

COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE ROLE EVALUATIONS OF THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE AND THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

Each of the role importance scales was tested for differences between the opinion leaders sample and the African American sample using analysis of variance. The results of these analyses, reported in Table 120, indicated that there were nine statistically significant differences. The opinion leaders systematically rated each of the roles significantly lower in importance than did the African Americans. Eight of these differences were non-trivial. The difference in the rating of the Formal Education Support Center role was trivial. The only role for which the difference was not significant was the Popular Materials Library role. Given the demographic characteristics of the opinion leaders sample, this pattern of differences is not surprising.

However, it does accent the difference in opinion between the African American community and the influential group of community opinion leaders.

COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE ROLE EVALUATIONS OF THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE AND THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

Each of the role importance scales was tested for differences between the opinion leaders sample and the Caucasian American sample using analysis of variance. The results of these analyses, reported in Table 121, indicated that there were four statistically significant but trivial differences between the two groups on their evaluations of the Reference Library role for personal information, the Research Center role, the Independent Learning Center role, and the Public Work Place role. For each of these roles, the opinions leaders rated the importance of the role lower than did the members of the Caucasian American sample. These results are similar to those obtained with the comparison of the opinion leaders sample to the national sample which was primarily composed of Caucasian Americans.

COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE ROLE EVALUATIONS OF THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE AND THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

Each of the role importance scales was tested for differences between the opinion leaders sample and the Hispanic American sample using analysis of variance. The results of these analyses, reported in Table 122, indicated that there were nine statistically significant differences. The opinion leaders systematically rated each of the roles significantly lower in importance than did the Hispanic Americans. Eight of these differences were non-trivial. The difference in the rating of the Formal Education Support Center role was trivial. The only role for which the difference was not significant was the Popular Materials Library role. These results are similar to those obtained with the comparison of the opinion leaders sample to the African American sample and also serves to accent the difference in opinion between the Hispanic American community and the community opinion leaders.

COMPARISONS OF OPINION ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES BETWEEN THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE AND THE NATIONAL SAMPLE, THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE, THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE, AND THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

The respondents' opinions about the amount of community spending for library services was tested for differences (using analysis of variance) between the opinion leaders sample and each of the other samples. The result of these analyses, reported in Table 123, indicated that there were two statistically significant but trivial differences. The opinion leaders thought that the community should spend more ($40.95 per capita) than did the national sample ($34.17) and the Caucasian sample ($33.65). Interestingly, there was no difference between the opinion leaders sample and either the African American sample or the Hispanic American sample. It appears therefore that, while the opinion leaders did not rate the importance of the roles of the library to the community as highly as did the African Americans and Hispanic Americans, the opinion leaders shared with the African Americans and Hispanic Americans a similar opinion about the amount of money the community should spend on library services.

TABLE 108
THE OPINION LEADERS' EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE VARIOUS ROLES OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY

(N = 300)

	$\bar{X}$	%
Formal Education Support Center	3.86	88.0%*
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.78	81.3%
Independent Learning Center	3.71	78.0%
Community Information Center	3.55	65.0%
Popular Materials Library	3.41	52.7%
Research Center	3.33	55.7%
Reference Library - Business	3.32	47.0%
Reference Library - Personal	3.29	38.0%
Community Activities Center	3.19	46.0%
Public Work Place	3.16	38.3%

Note: N is the sample size and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. % represents the percentage of the sample that rated the role "very important." For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the % of respondents who rated the role "very important."

TABLE 109
COMPARISONS AMONG THE OPINION LEADERS' GROUPS[*]

	Political Group (N = 75)		Media Group (N = 75)		Education Group (N = 75)		Business Group (N = 75)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.93	94.7	3.96	96.0	3.63	70.7	3.91	90.7	.000	.106
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.81	84.0	3.76	77.3	3.77	84.0	3.77	80.0	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.16	25.3	3.32	41.3	3.35	40.5	3.32	45.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.41	54.1	3.29	41.3	3.04	32.0	3.53	61.3	.000	.059
Community Activities Center	3.35	56.0	3.13	37.3	3.04	42.7	3.23	48.0	n.s.	
Research Center	3.57	67.6	3.26	50.0	3.05	42.7	3.44	64.0	.002	.049
Community Information Center	3.72	80.0	3.47	59.5	3.35	52.0	3.65	69.3	.004	.044
Independent Learning Center	3.83	85.3	3.75	77.3	3.56	70.7	3.72	78.7	.049	.026
Public Work Place	3.33	45.3	2.95	22.7	3.19	42.7	3.19	42.7	.028	.030
Popular Materials Library	3.39	53.3	3.31	47.3	3.55	61.3	3.41	49.3	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 202. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 110
COMPARISONS AMONG RESPONDENTS FROM DIFFERENT REGIONS OF THE COUNTRY[*]

	Northeast (N = 36)		South Central (N = 104)		North Central (N = 81)		West (N = 78)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.86	86.1	3.90	91.4	3.85	87.7	3.82	85.9	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.83	86.1	3.81	81.7	3.72	74.1	3.81	87.2	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.28	36.1	3.32	41.4	3.25	36.3	3.29	37.2	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.23	34.3	3.41	51.0	3.15	39.5	3.41	55.1	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.42	61.1	3.19	45.2	3.00	37.0	3.28	50.0	n.s.	
Research Center	3.29	51.4	3.42	63.1	3.20	46.9	3.37	59.0	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.72	80.6	3.66	71.8	3.36	50.6	3.51	64.1	.012	.037
Independent Learning Center	3.83	83.3	3.81	83.7	3.59	70.4	3.65	75.6	.044	.027
Public Work Place	3.17	44.4	3.14	37.5	3.15	33.3	3.21	42.3	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.39	52.8	3.36	50.5	3.47	56.8	3.46	52.6	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 202. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 111
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO VISITED AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT VISIT THE PUBLIC LIBRARY IN THE LAST YEAR*

	Visited library (N = 250)		Did not visit library (N = 50)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.84	87.2	3.92	92.0	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.78	81.6	3.76	80.0	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.31	39.0	3.18	34.0	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.34	46.2	3.24	52.0	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.17	45.2	3.28	50.0	n.s.	
Research Center	3.27	52.8	3.60	72.0	.016	.019
Community Information Center	3.52	64.3	3.68	70.0	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.70	76.8	3.78	84.0	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.14	36.4	3.26	48.0	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.37	49.8	3.62	68.0	.024	.017

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 202. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 112
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS BASED ON WHETHER SOMEONE ELSE WENT TO THE PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR THEM IN THE LAST YEAR[*]

	Yes (N = 156)		No (N = 143)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.87	88.5	3.84	87.4	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.74	79.5	3.82	83.2	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.24	35.5	3.34	40.6	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.30	46.5	3.35	48.3	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.27	51.3	3.09	39.9	n.s.	
Research Center	3.37	58.7	3.28	53.5	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.55	64.1	3.54	66.2	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.72	78.2	3.71	77.6	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.12	35.3	3.21	42.0	n.s.	
Popular Materials Library	3.37	48.7	3.47	57.8	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 202. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

Opinion Leaders Sample

TABLE 113

COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO CALLED THE PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR INFORMATION IN THE LAST YEAR AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT[*]

	Called library (N = 175)		Did not call library (N = 121)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.86	89.1	3.84	86.0	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.80	82.9	3.75	79.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.33	39.7	3.23	35.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.34	47.4	3.29	46.7	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.25	47.4	3.08	43.8	n.s.	
Research Center	3.32	54.3	3.32	57.1	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.53	64.0	3.58	67.5	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.68	76.6	3.76	80.2	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.09	33.7	3.28	46.3	.045	.014
Popular Materials Library	3.39	52.0	3.43	53.3	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 202. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 114
COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO IN ANY WAY USED THE PUBLIC LIBRARY IN THE LAST YEAR AND RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT[*]

	Users (N = 277)		Non-users (N = 23)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.85	87.7	3.91	91.3	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.78	81.6	3.74	78.3	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.28	37.7	3.35	43.5	n.s.	
Reference Library - Business	3.32	46.4	3.39	56.5	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.17	45.5	3.35	52.2	n.s.	
Research Center	3.31	54.9	3.57	69.6	n.s.	
Community Information Center	3.54	65.2	3.61	65.2	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.71	78.0	3.74	78.3	n.s.	
Public Work Place	3.13	36.1	3.57	65.2	.012	.021
Popular Materials Library	3.40	51.8	3.61	65.2	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 202. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 115
THE OPINION LEADERS' OPINIONS ABOUT LEVELS OF PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARY SERVICES

Amount	Frequency	Percent	Adjusted Percent*
$ 0	1	.3	0.0
$ 1 - $20	58	19.3	21.2
$21 - $40	101	33.7	37.0
$41 - $60	65	21.7	23.8
$61 - $80	17	5.7	6.2
$81 - $100	14	4.7	5.1
$101 -	17	5.7	6.2
Don't Know	27	9.0	Missing
Total	300		

---

*Note: Percentages recalculated with missing respondents excluded.

TABLE 116
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS[*]

	N	$\bar{X}$	C.I.
Entire Sample	273	$40.95	$37.69 - $44.21

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Opinion leaders' groups			n.s.	--	
Political	69	$44.06			$36.97 - $51.15
Media	64	$40.00			$33.46 - $46.54
Education	70	$38.00			$31.59 - $44.41
Business	70	$41.72			$35.30 - $48.13
Region of country			n.s.	--	
Northeast	28	$45.00			$35.18 - $54.82
South Central	98	$38.98			$33.33 - $44.62
North Central	75	$41.47			$35.08 - $47.85
West	71	$41.69			$35.26 - $48.12

---

[*] Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 202. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 117
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES BETWEEN LIBRARY USERS AND NON-USERS*

	N	$\bar{X}$	C.I.
Entire Sample	273	$40.95	$37.69 - $44.21

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Respondent went to public library last year			n.s.	--	
Yes	225	$40.93			$37.40 - $44.47
No	48	$41.04			$32.42 - $49.66
Someone else went to library for respondent			n.s.	--	
Yes	143	$43.92			$39.44 - $48.39
No	129	$37.91			$33.13 - $42.69
Respondent called library for information			.004	.031	
Yes	162	$44.26			$39.84 - $48.68
No	108	$34.63			$30.22 - $39.04
Respondent used library in any way last year			n.s.	--	
Yes	248	$40.52			$37.16 - $43.88
No	25	$45.20			$31.87 - $58.53

---

*Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 202. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

TABLE 118
SIGNIFICANT AND NON-TRIVIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN THE ROLE EVALUATION SCALE SCORES AND SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES FOR THE OPINION LEADERS GROUPS

	All Groups (N = 300)	Political Group (N = 75)	Media Group (N = 75)	Education Group (N = 75)	Business Group (N = 75)
Formal Education Support Center	.20			.30	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning					
Reference Library - Personal					
Reference Library - Business			.25	.30	
Community Activities Center	.22	.36			.25
Research Center	.16	.24			.26
Community Information Center	.17		.33		
Independent Learning Center			.24		
Public Work Place	.17	.32			
Popular Materials Library					

TABLE 119
COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE AND THE NATIONAL SAMPLE[*]

	Opinion Leader Sample (N = 300)		National Sample (N = 1001)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.86	88.0	3.85	88.1	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.78	81.3	3.81	83.2	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.29	38.1	3.39	48.4	.024	.004
Reference Library - Business	3.32	47.2	3.42	55.1	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.19	46.0	3.13	41.3	n.s.	
Research Center	3.33	56.0	3.59	68.2	.000	.017
Community Information Center	3.55	65.2	3.58	65.6	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.71	78.0	3.81	84.6	.002	.007
Public Work Place	3.16	38.3	3.38	52.4	.000	.013
Popular Materials Library	3.41	52.8	3.35	51.4	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 202. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 120
COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE AND THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE[*]

	Opinion Leader Sample (N = 300)		African American Sample (N = 401)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.86	88.0	3.94	96.5	.002	.014
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.78	81.3	3.94	95.7	.000	.038
Reference Library - Personal	3.29	38.1	3.70	74.8	.000	.099
Reference Library - Business	3.32	47.2	3.73	78.9	.000	.090
Community Activities Center	3.19	46.0	3.50	63.8	.000	.033
Research Center	3.33	56.0	3.79	84.7	.000	.092
Community Information Center	3.55	65.2	3.82	85.6	.000	.051
Independent Learning Center	3.71	78.0	3.89	93.1	.000	.030
Public Work Place	3.16	38.3	3.65	70.7	.000	.106
Popular Materials Library	3.41	52.8	3.52	61.5	n.s.	

---

[*] This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 202. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 121
COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE AND THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE*

	Opinion Leader Sample (N = 300)		Caucasian American Sample (N = 846)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.86	88.0	3.85	88.7	n.s.	
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.78	81.3	3.80	83.4	n.s.	
Reference Library - Personal	3.29	38.1	3.38	47.8	.043	.004
Reference Library - Business	3.32	47.2	3.39	54.8	n.s.	
Community Activities Center	3.19	46.0	3.11	41.0	n.s.	
Research Center	3.33	56.0	3.56	67.5	.000	.017
Community Information Center	3.55	65.2	3.56	65.1	n.s.	
Independent Learning Center	3.71	78.0	3.81	84.7	.006	.007
Public Work Place	3.16	38.3	3.36	51.7	.000	.012
Popular Materials Library	3.42	52.8	3.37	52.3	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 202. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 122
COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE AND THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE*

	Opinion Leader Sample (N = 300)		Hispanic American Sample (N = 399)			
	$\bar{X}$	%	$\bar{X}$	%	α	R^2
Formal Education Support Center	3.86	88.0	3.92	93.8	.045	.006
Preschoolers' Door to Learning	3.78	81.3	3.91	93.0	.000	.022
Reference Library - Personal	3.29	38.1	3.52	61.1	.000	.029
Reference Library - Business	3.32	47.2	3.62	72.7	.000	.041
Community Activities Center	3.19	46.0	3.46	61.5	.000	.025
Research Center	3.33	56.0	3.79	84.2	.000	.093
Community Information Center	3.55	65.2	3.81	85.3	.000	.047
Independent Learning Center	3.71	78.0	3.95	95.4	.000	.064
Public Work Place	3.16	38.3	3.64	74.9	.000	.089
Popular Materials Library	3.41	52.8	3.46	57.4	n.s.	

---

* This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean role importance scale scores for the groups of respondents identified by the column headings.

Note: N is the sample size for each group and represents, in general, the number of respondents who rated each role. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean rating for each role on the four-point importance scale. Explanations of α (the alpha level) and R^2 (the coefficient of determination) are provided on page 202. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the group means are *not* statistically significant. % represents the percentage of each group that rated the role "very important." These % are presented for descriptive purposes. For some roles there were a few non-respondents, but these slight differences in sample sizes are inconsequential for the purpose of estimating the sampling error associated with the percentage of respondents who rated the roles "very important."

TABLE 123
COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SUGGESTED PER CAPITA SPENDING FOR LIBRARIES BETWEEN THE OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE AND THE NATIONAL SAMPLE, THE CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE, THE AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE, AND THE HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

	N	$\bar{X}$	α	R^2	C.I.
Opinion leaders sample (compared to...)	273	\$40.95			\$37.69 - \$44.21
...National sample	876	\$34.17	.001	.009	\$32.30 - \$36.05
...African American sample	357	\$39.90	n.s.	--	\$36.13 - \$43.67
...Caucasian American sample	737	\$33.65	.000	.014	\$31.68 - \$35.61
...Hispanic American sample	321	\$39.26	n.s.	--	\$35.21 - \$43.30

---

[*] Note: This table reports the summary analyses of variance for the comparisons among the mean amounts of suggested per capita spending by various groups of respondents.

Note: N is the sample size for each group. $\bar{X}$ represents the mean amount of suggested per capita spending. Detailed explanations of the alpha level (α) and R^2 are provided on page 202. The initials n.s. indicate that the observed differences among the groups are *not* statistically significant. C.I. reports the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval for estimating the mean amount of suggested spending for each group reported. These intervals are appropriate for use with those groups that are statistically different. For an explanation of confidence intervals see pages 10 and 11.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire used in all of the surveys is presented on the following pages. Please note that the Gallup Organization formatted the response categories to the role evaluation questions as follows: 1 = very important; 2 = moderately important; 3 = slightly important; and 4 = not important. For analysis of the data, these response categories were recoded so that the higher the code the higher the evaluation of the importance of the role. The mean scores for role importance that appear in this report were calculated with these recoded response categories.

FINANCE,MIN11741
F741

FIELD FINAL - MAY 7, 1992

AC513
Project Registration #11903701
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

National Sample
Perception of Public Libraries
The Gallup Organization, Inc.
Max Larsen/Elaine Christiansen/
Susan Sluyter, Specwriter
May, 1992 n=1,000

X APPROVED BY CLIENT

DATE ______________________

INTERVIEWED BY ______________________

I.D.#: 0 (1-6)

REGION: **(Coded from tape) ____ (28)

STRATUM: **(Coded from tape) ____ (29)

STATE: **(Coded from tape) ____ (16) ____ (17)

**AREA CODE AND TELEPHONE NUMBER: ( ) ______________ ____ (32 - 41) ____

**INTERVIEW TIME: -- ____ (42) ____ (43)

Now I am going to ask you several questions about your background.

D1. AGE: In what year were you born? (Open ended **and code actual year)**

9998 (DK)
9999 (Refused)

______________________ ____ (430) ____ (431) 18 (432) ____ (433)

D2. Are you, yourself, of Hispanic or Latino origin or descent? **(If necessary, read:)** Such as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other Spanish background?

1	2	3	4	
Yes	No	(DK)	(RF)	19 (434)
(Continue)		**(Skip to D4)**		

D3. **(If code "1" in D2, ask:)** Which of the following? **(Read 1-4)**

1 Mexican
2 Mexican-American or Chicano
3 Puerto Rican
4 Cuban
5 Other (i.e. Salvadoran, Columbian) (Do NOT list)

6 (DK)
7 (Refused) 20 (435)

(DEMOGRAPHICS CONTINUED)

D4. RACE: What is your race? **(If necessary, ask:)** Are you white, black, American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Eskimo or Aleutian or some other race?

01 Some other (list)
02 (DK)
03 (Refused)
04 HOLD
05 HOLD

06 White
07 Black
08 American Indian
09 Asian/Pacific Islander
10 Eskimo or Aleutian

21.10

(436) (437)

D5. EDUCATION: What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Open ended and code) **(Write degree if unsure)**

01 Other (list)
02 (DK)
03 (Refused)
04 Kindergarten or less
05 HOLD

06 1st grade
07 2nd grade
08 3rd grade
09 4th grade
10 5th grade
11 6th grade
12 7th grade
13 8th grade
14 9th grade
15 10th grade
16 11th grade
17 12th grade
18 Some college/No degree
19 Associate degree
20 Bachelor's degree
21 Master's degree
22 Professional school degree
23 Doctoral degree

22.10

(438) (439)

(If code "04-17" in D5, Continue;
If code "19" in D5, Skip to D7;
All others, Skip to D8)

(DEMOGRAPHICS CONTINUED)

D6. **(If code "04-17" in D5, ask:)** Do you have a high school diploma or equivalent?

1	2	3	4
Yes	No	(DK)	(RF)

23 ____(440)

(All in D6, Skip to D8)

D7. **(If code "19" in D5, ask:)** Was it an occupational program or an academic program?

1 Occupational program
2 Academic program
3 (DK)
4 (Refused)

24 ____(441)

D8. Which of the following categories best describes your current marital status, married, widowed, divorced, or never married?

1 Married - **(Continue)**

2 Widowed
3 Divorced
4 Never married
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)
(Skip to D10)

25 ____(442)

D9. **(If code "1" in D8, ask:)** Are you currently living with your spouse?

1	2	3	4
Yes	No	(DK)	(RF)

26 ____(443)

D10. How many people including yourself are living in your home? (Open ended **and code actual number)**

01 One - **(Skip to D13)**

97 97+

98 (DK)
99 (Refused) **(Skip to D13)**

____

27
____ ____
(444) (445)

D11. **(If code "02-97" in D10, ask:)** How many of these are pre-school aged children? (Open ended **and code actual number)**

00 None
97 97+
98 (DK)
99 (Refused)

____

28
____ ____
(446) (447)

(DEMOGRAPHICS CONTINUED)

D12. How many are in grade school, junior high, high school, or college? (Open ended **and code actual number)**

00 None
97 97+
98 (DK)
99 (Refused)

29

____ (448) (449)

D13. Are you currently a student or enrolled in a training program?

1	2	3	4
Yes	No	(DK)	(RF)
(Continue)	**(Skip to D15)**		

30 (450)

D14. **(If code "1" in D13, ask:)** What are you currently enrolled in? **(Read 1-5)**

1 High school or equivalency
2 Training program
3 College
4 Graduate or professional school
5 Other (Do NOT list)

6 (DK)
7 (Refused)

31 (451)

D15. What language is primarily spoken in your household? (Open ended and code)

01 Other (list)
02 (DK)
03 (Refused)
04 HOLD
05 HOLD

06 English
07 Spanish
08 English/Spanish spoken equally
09 Southeast Asian (Korean, Vietnamese, Thai, etc.)
10 Russian

32.10

____ (452) (453)

D16. Which one of the following categories best describes your current employment status? **(Read 1-5)**

1 Employed full-time
2 Employed part-time
3 Unemployed
4 Retired
5 Not in work force

6 (DK)
7 (Refused)

33 (454)

(DEMOGRAPHICS CONTINUED)

D17. Is your total annual household income before taxes, over or under $35,000?

(If "Under", ask:) Is it over or under $30,000?
(If "Under", ask:) Is it over or under $25,000?
(If "Under", ask:) Is it over or under $20,000?
(If "Under", ask:) Is it over or under $15,000?
(If "Under", ask:) Is it over or under $10,000?
(If "Under", ask:) Is it over or under $5,000?

(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $40,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $45,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $50,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $55,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $60,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $65,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $70,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $75,000?

01	Under $5,000
02	$5,000 to $9,999
03	$10,000 to $14,999
04	$15,000 to $19,999
05	$20,000 to $24,999
06	$25,000 to $29,999
07	$30,000 to $34,999
08	$35,000 to $39,999
09	$40,000 to $44,999
10	$45,000 to $49,999
11	$50,000 to $54,999
12	$55,000 to $59,999
13	$60,000 to $64,999
14	$65,000 to $69,999
15	$70,000 to $74,999
16	$75,000 or more
17	(DK)
18	(Refused)

34
(53) (54)

D18. COUNTY: What is the name of the county in which your community is located? (Open ended)

001	Other (list)
002	(DK)
003	(Refused)
004	HOLD
005	HOLD

35.10
(455) (456) (457)

D19. COMMUNITY: What is the name of the community in which you live? (Open ended)

001	Other (list)
002	(DK)
003	(Refused)
004	HOLD
005	HOLD

36.10
(458) (459) (460)

(DEMOGRAPHICS CONTINUED)

D20. ZIP CODE: What is your zip code? (Open ended **and code all five digits)**

99998 (DK)
99999 (Refused)

37
____ (21) ____ (22) ____ (23) ____ (24) ____ (25)

The next questions are about disabilities. A disability is a physical or mental condition which substantially limits a major life activity such as walking, seeing, hearing, or reading.

D21. Using the definition I just gave you, does anyone in your household have a physical or mental disability right now?

1 Yes **(Continue)**	2 No	3 (DK)	4 (RF)	38 ____ (461)
	(Thank and Validate)			

D22. **(If code "1" in D21, ask:)** Is this person you, or someone else in your household?

1 Respondent - **(Continue)**

2 Someone else - **(Thank and Validate)**

3 (Both) - **(Continue)**

4 (DK)
5 (Refused) **(Thank and Validate)** 39 ____ (462)

D23. **(If code "1" or "3" in D22, ask:)** Does YOUR disability most affect **(read 1-6)**?

1 Seeing
2 Hearing
3 Walking
4 Speaking
5 Mental functioning, OR
6 Something else (Do NOT list)

7 (DK)
8 (Refused) 40 ____ (463)

(VALIDATE PHONE NUMBER AND THANK RESPONDENT)

Hello, this is ______________ with The Gallup Organization. We are conducting a survey tonight about perceptions of public libraries. First I have a few general questions. May I please speak with the youngest male, 18 years of age or older, who is now at home? **(If "No male", ask:)** May I please speak with the oldest female, 18 years of age or older, who is now at home? **(When qualified respondent is reached, continue:)**

1 Yes, male
2 Yes, female **(Continue)** ______(44)

---

1. Did you vote in the last presidential election?

1 Yes 2 No 3 (DK) 4 (RF) 2.50(412)

2. Did you, yourself, go to a public library in the past year?

1 Yes **(Continue)** 2 No 3 (DK) **(Skip to #3)** 4 (RF) 2.60(413)

2a. **(If code "1" in #2, ask:)** How many times did you go to a public library in the past year? Would you say about **(read 1-6)**?

1 1 to 5 times
2 6 to 10 times
3 11 to 15 times
4 16 to 20 times
5 21 to 25 times
6 26 times or more

7 (DK)
8 (Refused) 2.70(414)

3. In the past year, has anyone else gone to a public library to borrow books or other kinds of materials for you or to get information for you?

1 Yes 2 No 3 (DK) 4 (RF) 3 (415)

4. Have you called a public library for information in the past year?

1 Yes 2 No 3 (DK) 4 (RF) 4 (416)

Now I'm going to describe to you some of the kinds of services that public libraries provide for their communities. Some people think these services are important while others do not. After each description, I'd like you to tell me how important you think that kind of service is to your community. Is it very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important.

5. The library provides students, both children and adults, with the books, magazines and other services they need to do their school work. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused) ___5___ (417)

6. The library provides preschool children with picture books, story hours, and educational programs so that these children can have fun and learn to appreciate reading. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused) ___6___ (418)

7. The library provides people with the information they need to answer personal and household questions. This could include, for example, information about how to fix things around the house, hobbies, health issues, or the quality and prices of home appliances. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused) ___7___ (419)

8. The library provides businesses in your community with the information they need to survive and prosper. This could include, for example, information about sales or marketing, worker safety, environmental protection, or setting up a new business. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused) ___8___ (420)

9. The library serves as a neighborhood or community activity center, a place where organizations or clubs could hold meetings or present concerts and lectures. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

9____(421)

10. The library provides scientists and scholars with the specialized research collections of books, magazines and computerized information they need in order to do research or write books. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

10____(422)

11. The library provides people with information about their community. This could include, for example, information about local government, issues or laws or about local community services such as health clinics or daycare. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

11____(423)

12. The library provides adults who are NOT students with the materials and services they need in order to better themselves or to learn a new skill such as how to read and write. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

12____(424)

13. The library provides people with a comfortable place to go when they need someplace outside of their house or apartment to read or think or work. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

13 ___(425)

14. The library provides people with a collection of current best selling books and popular magazines, videos and musical recordings for borrowing. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

14 ___(426)

15. Some communities in this country spend as little as $4 per person a year to provide a limited selection of the kinds of services that we just described while other communities spend as much as $100 per person a year to provide a much wider selection of these services. On average, communities in this country spend about $16 per person a year on their public libraries. How much money do you think your community should spend annually on its public library? Would you say **(read 1-6)**?

1 $1 to $20 per person
2 $21 to $40 per person
3 $41 to $60 per person
4 $61 to $80 per person
5 $81 to $100 per person
6 More than $100 per person
7 ($0 per person/Nothing)
8 (DK)
9 (Refused)

15 ___(427)

16. We are interested in how people feel about their current financial situation. Would you say that you are financially better off now than you were a year ago, or are you financially worse off now or are you about the same?

1 Better off
2 Worse off
3 About the same
4 (DK)
5 (Refused)

16 ___(428)

17. Now looking ahead, do you expect that at this time next year you will be financially better off than now, or worse off than now or about the same?

1 Better off
2 Worse off
3 About the same
4 (DK)
5 (Refused)

17 ____ (429)

(GO TO DEMOGRAPHICS)

INTERVIEWER I.D.# ____ (241) ____ (242) ____ (243) ____ (244)

THE ROLES OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY IN SOCIETY

THE RESULTS OF A NATIONAL SURVEY

FINAL REPORT: APPENDIX

GEORGE D'ELIA
INFORMATION & DECISION SCIENCES DEPARTMENT
CARLSON SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

IN COLLABORATION WITH

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA CENTER FOR SURVEY RESEARCH

AND

THE GALLUP ORGANIZATION

DISTRIBUTED BY

THE URBAN LIBRARIES COUNCIL
1800 RIDGE AVENUE, SUITE 208
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60201

1993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This project (R039A10030) was supported by a grant from Library Programs, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under the Library Research and Demonstration Program of the Higher Education Act, Title II-B. The contents of this report do not reflect the policy nor do they carry the endorsement of the U.S. Department of Education.

FOREWORD

This Appendix contains three parts. Part I reports the methodology used by the Gallup Organization for drawing the national probability sample, the supplemental minority samples (the African American and Hispanic American samples), and the opinion leaders sample and for executing the surveys. Part II contains a copy of the questionnaire that was used in all the surveys. Part III contains the frequency distributions for the responses obtain from the respondents in each of the surveys.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I: METHODOLOGY 1

PART II: QUESTIONNAIRE 8

PART III: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS 20

    The National Sample 21
    The African American Sample 37
    The Caucasian American Sample 53
    The Hispanic Sample 69
    The Opinion Leaders Sample 85

PART I. METHODOLOGY[1]

HOUSEHOLD SAMPLING

National Survey

For sampling telephone households, Gallup uses a stratified, list-assisted random-digit design. The sample is purchased from Survey Sampling, Incorporated, of Fairfield, Connecticut and updated quarterly.

In order to avoid listing bias, a random digit procedure designed to provide representation of both listed and unlisted (including not-yet-listed) numbers is used. The design of the sample ensures this representation by random regeneration of the last two digits of "seed" telephone numbers selected from a sampling frame of listed telephone numbers stratified by area code, telephone exchange ("telephone exchange" is here used broadly to denote the three digits of a 10-digit telephone number that follow the area code), and bank number (the seventh and eight digits).

The first eight digits of the sample telephone numbers (area code, telephone exchange, and ban number) are selected after geographic pre-stratification of a database of listed telephone numbers and adjustment of sampling fractions at the exchange level, so that state, county, and telephone exchange within county are all represented in their appropriate proportions. That is, the number of telephone numbers randomly sampled from within a given exchange is proportional to that exchange's share of estimated telephone households in the set of exchanges from which the sample is drawn.

Only "working banks" of numbers are used for seed number selection. A working bank is defined as 100 contiguous telephone numbers containing three or more residential telephone listings. By eliminating nonworking banks of numbers from the sample, the likelihood that any sampled telephone number will be associated with a residence increases from only 20% (where all banks of numbers are sampled) to approximately 70%. Since most banks of telephone numbers are either substantially filled (i.e., assigned) or empty, this practical efficiency is purchased at a negligible cost in terms of possible noncoverage bias.

The sample of telephone numbers produced by this method is thus designed to produce an unbiased random sampling of telephone households in the continental United States. The total sample of generated numbers is divided into random subsamples or "replicates," and the telephone management system releases them sequentially, as needed, in order to ensure that the highest possible response rate can be achieved.

---

[1] The following information about methodology was provided to the University of Minnesota by The Gallup Organization.

African American and Hispanic American Survey

In order to efficiently complete additional interviews among blacks and nonblack Hispanics, a supplemental sample was purchased from Survey Sampling, Incorporated. The design of these disproportionate samples involves the analysis of a database of 15 million listed telephone numbers that is itself a random sample of a master database of over 60 million listed numbers. The 15 million record database includes census tract geo-coding for 90% of the file, allowing each geo-coded record to be associated with a specific geographic unit. The availability of 1990 Census estimates of racial and ethnic density for these units provides the crucial link that makes the disproportionate sampling design possible. Two variables are merged into the database for each geo-coded record: the Black density and the Hispanic density of the associated tract. Having accomplished this step, it is possible, by simply aggregating the data, to compute (separate) central tendency estimates of Black and Hispanic density for combinations of area code and telephone exchange and to array these area code exchange combinations from high to low estimated density. It is further possible to divide the array into several discrete estimated density strata, and by employing different sampling fractions in the various strata, to draw a sample of seed numbers that over-represents geographic areas of high density for the racial or ethnic target group.

Random regeneration of the last two digits of the seed numbers was used to create the final sample of telephone numbers. The telephone numbers generated in this step fell into the same area code exchange combination as the seed numbers from which they were generated, and the procedure therefore maintained the integrity of the density strata. The sampling fractions that control the disproportionality in combination with information on the qualification rate within each of the sampling strata were used as the basis for the calculation and assignment of sampling weights. The goal of these procedures was to provide samples which yielded a higher percentage of Hispanic and non-Hispanic black respondents, while at the same time providing the ability to correct the disproportionality with precision prior to the use of the data for estimation.

The sample of telephone numbers generated for each of the density strata was divided into an equal number of random subsamples or "replicates." The relative proportions of telephone numbers used by telephone interviewers released from the various strata was controlled by the computerized sample management system via the mechanism of releasing replicates "in parallel" across the sampling strata, in order to ensure the application of sampling weights described above appropriately equalized the selection probabilities across strata.

WITHIN HOUSEHOLD SAMPLING

National Survey, African American and Hispanic American Survey

Respondents, aged 18 years or older, were selected using the "youngest male/oldest female" method of selection. This technique requires the interviewer to attempt to complete an interview with the youngest available male in the household or, if no male is available, with the oldest available female. It is a systematic, empirically-based procedure developed at Gallup several decades ago, that has been shown to provide a close approximation to the appropriate distribution of gender by age, according to data available from the Census bureau. It is a systematic method designed to compensate for nonresponse biases by age and sex. It was designed to provide a means to avoid under-representing age by gender-defined demographic strata (e.g., young males) that are particularly difficult to represent in their appropriate proportions in surveys either because they are relatively unlikely to be at home, or because they are relatively likely to refuse to be interviewed. Thus, the youngest male/oldest female method tends to produce a sample of completed interviews that more closely mirrors the true distribution of age within gender than the results of more random selection methods.

WEIGHTING ALGORITHMS

Separate weighting were required for the national sample and the minority oversamples in order to convert sample responses to national estimates. Weighting was used both to correct disproportionality imposed at the design stage, and minimize a variety of possible types of survey error that would effect survey-based estimates, including both random error and systematic biases.

National Random Sample

The national random sample data was submitted to a ratio estimation routine that ensured the demographic characteristics of the weighted sample conform to the best available Census estimates of the characteristics of the target population. The weighting procedure fits the observed proportions of a demographic cross-classification table to the estimates of the population parameters for the same table, using age, gender, race, formal educational attainment and region of the country as variables.

Supplemental Samples of African Americans and Hispanic Americans

The weighting of this phase was more complex than the weighting of the national data because there was considerably more disproportionality built into the design.

The first weighting task was to correct the disproportionality in the supplementary samples of Hispanic and non-Hispanic black respondents implicit in the use of different sampling fractions for selecting telephone numbers from the various density strata. This weighting was based on information about the sampling fraction employed in selecting the telephone numbers in the various density strata described above, in conjunction with the information on the rate of (racial or ethnic) qualification within each of these same density strata. This information was gathered during the data collection stage.

When the supplemental sample of Hispanic respondents was combined with the sample of Hispanic respondents obtained during the 1,000 national random interviews, an appropriate correction for the disproportionality designed into the oversampling of high density Hispanic areas was made. A similar procedure was used for the combination of the parallel samples of non-Hispanic black respondents and the correction of the parallel disproportionalities for non-Hispanic black respondents.

RESPONSE RATES

National Survey, African American and Hispanic American Survey

The response rate for the national survey was 45%. The response rate for the minority survey was 53%. These response rates were calculated from the following data using the formula in Figure A.

Disposition	National Random	Minority Oversample
Completes	1,001	679
Terminate (screener complete)	2	9
Quota Filled	195	82
Scheduled callbacks (screener complete)	0	0
Refusals	713	930
Disconnected	786	1,129
Failed screener	0	2,570
Nonresidential	241	563
Deaf/language	23	85
Busy	12	35
Answering machine	162	269
No answer	391	1,229
Terminate (screener incomplete)	55	130
Terminate (screener unknown)	0	0
Scheduled callbacks (screener incomplete)	150	364

FIGURE A.

$$\mathit{ResponseRate} = \frac{\mathit{number\ completes}}{\mathit{number\ eligible} + [\frac{\mathit{number\ eligible}}{\mathit{eligible} + \mathit{not\ eligible}} \times \mathit{number\ status\ unknown}]}$$

Eligible = Completes + Breakoff (screener complete) + Quota Fill + callbacks (screener complete) + refusals

Not Eligible = Nonworking/disconnected + failed screener + nonresidential + language/deafness

Unknown = Busy + answering machine + no answer + breakoff (screener incomplete) + breakoff (screener unknown) + callbacks (screener incomplete).

OPINION LEADERS SURVEY

Opinion Leaders Sample

The sample for the opinion leaders' survey was derived from a variety of sources in each of four general areas: political, educational, media and business/associations/organizations. The following lists the sources used to derive the sample for each of the four groups:

Political Leaders

Yellow Pages, under the headings of political organizations, labor unions, and lobbying groups

Carroll Directories for state, county and municipal executives

Educational Leaders

CIC's School Directory for superintendent and/or principal of school systems

Patterson's Elementary Education (1991 and 1992)

Media Leaders

Newspapers -- *IMS Directory of Publications* for local news/lifestyle editors

Radio -- *Arbitron Directory*

Television -- *Television and Cable Factbook*

Business/Associations/Organization

Yellow Pages under headings of business and trade organizations and human service organizations.

Each piece of randomly selected sample was subjected to a minimum of five call attempts in order to ensure greater representativeness of the final data. Quotas were set at 75 per group. All interviews were conducted by Gallup's Executive Interviewing Team located at Gallup Operation Headquarters in Lincoln, Nebraska.

Gallup interviewers are trained to screen to the type of person targeted (in this case, a business or organizational "leader"). Since the sample was pulled from a variety of sources, there was no one selection "script" which applied to every piece of sample.

When a randomly selected organization was contacted, the organization's Chief Executive Officer (or equivalent title) was requested. In some cases, the name of the CEO (or equivalent) was available from the sample source. In other cases, only the title of the CEO was available. For example, when targeting a public school system, the Office of the Superintendent was contacted and the current Superintendent interviewed.

Response Rate for the Opinion Leaders Survey

If the organization's CEO referred our interviewer to someone else in the organization, that individual was contacted. Callbacks were made when necessary to contact an identified potential respondent.

The response rate for this project was calculated by the product of the contact rate (% of working sample contacted), the cooperation rate (the percentage of those contacted who agreed to do the survey) and the completion rate (the percentage of those cooperating who actually completed the survey). The calculation for this project was:

Contact	X	Cooperation	X	Completion	=	Response rate
.88	x	.65	x	1.00	=	58%

PART II. THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire used in all the surveys is presented on the following pages.

FINANCE,MIN11741
F741

FIELD FINAL - MAY 7, 1992

AC513
Project Registration #11903701
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

National Sample
Perception of Public Libraries
The Gallup Organization, Inc.
Max Larsen/Elaine Christiansen/
Susan Sluyter, Specwriter
May, 1992 n=1,000

X APPROVED BY CLIENT

DATE________________________

INTERVIEWED BY________________________

I.D.#: 0 (1-6)

REGION: **(Coded from tape) _____(28)

STRATUM: **(Coded from tape) _____(29)

STATE: **(Coded from tape) _____ _____ (16) (17)

**AREA CODE AND TELEPHONE NUMBER: ( )________________ _____ - _____ (32 - 41)

**INTERVIEW TIME: -- _____ _____ (42) (43)

Now I am going to ask you several questions about your background.

D1. AGE: In what year were you born? (Open ended **and code actual year)**

9998 (DK)
9999 (Refused)

________________________ _____ _____ 18 _____ (430) (431) (432) (433)

D2. Are you, yourself, of Hispanic or Latino origin or descent? **(If necessary, read:)** Such as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other Spanish background?

1	2	3	4
Yes	No	(DK)	(RF)
(Continue)	**(Skip to D4)**		

19 (434)

D3. **(If code "1" in D2, ask:)** Which of the following? **(Read 1-4)**

1 Mexican
2 Mexican-American or Chicano
3 Puerto Rican
4 Cuban
5 Other (i.e. Salvadoran, Columbian) (Do NOT list)

6 (DK)
7 (Refused)

20 (435)

(DEMOGRAPHICS CONTINUED)

D4. RACE: What is your race? **(If necessary, ask:)** Are you white, black, American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Eskimo or Aleutian or some other race?

01 Some other (list)
02 (DK)
03 (Refused)
04 HOLD
05 HOLD

06 White
07 Black
08 American Indian
09 Asian/Pacific Islander
10 Eskimo or Aleutian

21.10

(436) (437)

D5. EDUCATION: What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Open ended and code) **(Write degree if unsure)**

01 Other (list)
02 (DK)
03 (Refused)
04 Kindergarten or less
05 HOLD

06 1st grade
07 2nd grade
08 3rd grade
09 4th grade
10 5th grade
11 6th grade
12 7th grade
13 8th grade
14 9th grade
15 10th grade
16 11th grade
17 12th grade
18 Some college/No degree
19 Associate degree
20 Bachelor's degree
21 Master's degree
22 Professional school degree
23 Doctoral degree

22.10

(438) (439)

(If code "04-17" in D5, Continue;
If code "19" in D5, Skip to D7;
All others, Skip to D8)

(DEMOGRAPHICS CONTINUED)

D6. **(If code "04-17" in D5, ask:)** Do you have a high school diploma or equivalent?

1	2	3	4
Yes	No	(DK)	(RF)

23 (440)

(All in D6, Skip to D8)

D7. **(If code "19" in D5, ask:)** Was it an occupational program or an academic program?

1 Occupational program
2 Academic program
3 (DK)
4 (Refused)

24 (441)

D8. Which of the following categories best describes your current marital status, married, widowed, divorced, or never married?

1 Married - **(Continue)**

2 Widowed
3 Divorced
4 Never married
(Skip to D10)
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

25 (442)

D9. **(If code "1" in D8, ask:)** Are you currently living with your spouse?

1	2	3	4
Yes	No	(DK)	(RF)

26 (443)

D10. How many people including yourself are living in your home? (Open ended **and code actual number)**

01 One - **(Skip to D13)**

97 97+

98 (DK)
99 (Refused) **(Skip to D13)**

27

(444) (445)

D11. **(If code "02-97" in D10, ask:)** How many of these are pre-school aged children? (Open ended **and code actual number)**

00 None
97 97+
98 (DK)
99 (Refused)

28

(446) (447)

(DEMOGRAPHICS CONTINUED)

D12. How many are in grade school, junior high, high school, or college? (Open ended **and code actual number)**

00 None
97 97+
98 (DK)
99 (Refused)

29
(448) (449)

D13. Are you currently a student or enrolled in a training program?

1	2	3	4
Yes	No	(DK)	(RF)
(Continue)		**(Skip to D15)**	

30 (450)

D14. **(If code "1" in D13, ask:)** What are you currently enrolled in? **(Read 1-5)**

1 High school or equivalency
2 Training program
3 College
4 Graduate or professional school
5 Other (Do NOT list)

6 (DK)
7 (Refused)

31 (451)

D15. What language is primarily spoken in your household? (Open ended and code)

01 Other (list)
02 (DK)
03 (Refused)
04 HOLD
05 HOLD

06 English
07 Spanish
08 English/Spanish spoken equally
09 Southeast Asian (Korean, Vietnamese, Thai, etc.)
10 Russian

32.10
(452) (453)

D16. Which one of the following categories best describes your current employment status? **(Read 1-5)**

1 Employed full-time
2 Employed part-time
3 Unemployed
4 Retired
5 Not in work force

6 (DK)
7 (Refused)

33 (454)

(DEMOGRAPHICS CONTINUED)

D17. Is your total annual household income before taxes, over or under $35,000?

(If "Under", ask:) Is it over or under $30,000?
(If "Under", ask:) Is it over or under $25,000?
(If "Under", ask:) Is it over or under $20,000?
(If "Under", ask:) Is it over or under $15,000?
(If "Under", ask:) Is it over or under $10,000?
(If "Under", ask:) Is it over or under $5,000?

(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $40,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $45,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $50,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $55,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $60,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $65,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $70,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $75,000?

01	Under $5,000
02	$5,000 to $9,999
03	$10,000 to $14,999
04	$15,000 to $19,999
05	$20,000 to $24,999
06	$25,000 to $29,999
07	$30,000 to $34,999
08	$35,000 to $39,999
09	$40,000 to $44,999
10	$45,000 to $49,999
11	$50,000 to $54,999
12	$55,000 to $59,999
13	$60,000 to $64,999
14	$65,000 to $69,999
15	$70,000 to $74,999
16	$75,000 or more
17	(DK)
18	(Refused)

34

(53) (54)

D18. COUNTY: What is the name of the county in which your community is located? (Open ended)

001	Other (list)
002	(DK)
003	(Refused)
004	HOLD
005	HOLD

35.10

(455) (456) (457)

D19. COMMUNITY: What is the name of the community in which you live? (Open ended)

001	Other (list)
002	(DK)
003	(Refused)
004	HOLD
005	HOLD

36.10

(458) (459) (460)

(DEMOGRAPHICS CONTINUED)

D20. ZIP CODE: What is your zip code? (Open ended **and code all five digits)**

99998 (DK)
99999 (Refused)

37

____ ____ ____ ____ ____
(21) (22) (23) (24) (25)

The next questions are about disabilities. A disability is a physical or mental condition which substantially limits a major life activity such as walking, seeing, hearing, or reading.

D21. Using the definition I just gave you, does anyone in your household have a physical or mental disability right now?

1	2	3	4	
Yes	No	(DK)	(RF)	38 (461)
(Continue)	**(Thank and Validate)**			

D22. **(If code "1" in D21, ask:)** Is this person you, or someone else in your household?

1 Respondent - **(Continue)**

2 Someone else - **(Thank and Validate)**

3 (Both) - **(Continue)**

4 (DK)
5 (Refused) **(Thank and Validate)** 39 (462)

D23. **(If code "1" or "3" in D22, ask:)** Does YOUR disability most affect **(read 1-6)**?

1 Seeing
2 Hearing
3 Walking
4 Speaking
5 Mental functioning, OR
6 Something else (Do NOT list)

7 (DK)
8 (Refused) 40 (463)

(VALIDATE PHONE NUMBER AND THANK RESPONDENT)

Hello, this is ____________ with The Gallup Organization. We are conducting a survey tonight about perceptions of public libraries. First I have a few general questions. May I please speak with the youngest male, 18 years of age or older, who is now at home? **(If "No male", ask:)** May I please speak with the oldest female, 18 years of age or older, who is now at home? **(When qualified respondent is reached, continue:)**

1 Yes, male
2 Yes, female **(Continue)** _____(44)

---

1. Did you vote in the last presidential election?

1	2	3	4	
Yes	No	(DK)	(RF)	2.50 (412)

2. Did you, yourself, go to a public library in the past year?

1	2	3	4	
Yes	No	(DK)	(RF)	2.60 (413)
(Continue)	**(Skip to #3)**			

2a. **(If code "1" in #2, ask:)** How many times did you go to a public library in the past year? Would you say about **(read 1-6)**?

1 1 to 5 times
2 6 to 10 times
3 11 to 15 times
4 16 to 20 times
5 21 to 25 times
6 26 times or more

7 (DK)
8 (Refused) 2.70 (414)

3. In the past year, has anyone else gone to a public library to borrow books or other kinds of materials for you or to get information for you?

1	2	3	4	
Yes	No	(DK)	(RF)	3 (415)

4. Have you called a public library for information in the past year?

1	2	3	4	
Yes	No	(DK)	(RF)	4 (416)

Now I'm going to describe to you some of the kinds of services that public libraries provide for their communities. Some people think these services are important while others do not. After each description, I'd like you to tell me how important you think that kind of service is to your community. Is it very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important.

5. The library provides students, both children and adults, with the books, magazines and other services they need to do their school work. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

5 (417)

6. The library provides preschool children with picture books, story hours, and educational programs so that these children can have fun and learn to appreciate reading. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

6 (418)

7. The library provides people with the information they need to answer personal and household questions. This could include, for example, information about how to fix things around the house, hobbies, health issues, or the quality and prices of home appliances. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

7 (419)

8. The library provides businesses in your community with the information they need to survive and prosper. This could include, for example, information about sales or marketing, worker safety, environmental protection, or setting up a new business. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

8 (420)

9. The library serves as a neighborhood or community activity center, a place where organizations or clubs could hold meetings or present concerts and lectures. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

9 ___ (421)

10. The library provides scientists and scholars with the specialized research collections of books, magazines and computerized information they need in order to do research or write books. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

10 ___ (422)

11. The library provides people with information about their community. This could include, for example, information about local government, issues or laws or about local community services such as health clinics or daycare. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

11 ___ (423)

12. The library provides adults who are NOT students with the materials and services they need in order to better themselves or to learn a new skill such as how to read and write. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

12 ___ (424)

13. The library provides people with a comfortable place to go when they need someplace outside of their house or apartment to read or think or work. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

13 ___(425)

14. The library provides people with a collection of current best selling books and popular magazines, videos and musical recordings for borrowing. How important would you say that this service is to your community? **(If necessary, reread scale)**

1 Very important
2 Moderately important
3 Slightly important
4 Not important
5 (DK)
6 (Refused)

14 ___(426)

15. Some communities in this country spend as little as $4 per person a year to provide a limited selection of the kinds of services that we just described while other communities spend as much as $100 per person a year to provide a much wider selection of these services. On average, communities in this country spend about $16 per person a year on their public libraries. How much money do you think your community should spend annually on its public library? Would you say **(read 1-6)**?

1 $1 to $20 per person
2 $21 to $40 per person
3 $41 to $60 per person
4 $61 to $80 per person
5 $81 to $100 per person
6 More than $100 per person
7 ($0 per person/Nothing)
8 (DK)
9 (Refused)

15 ___(427)

16. We are interested in how people feel about their current financial situation. Would you say that you are financially better off now than you were a year ago, or are you financially worse off now or are you about the same?

1 Better off
2 Worse off
3 About the same
4 (DK)
5 (Refused)

16 ___(428)

17. Now looking ahead, do you expect that at this time next year you will be financially better off than now, or worse off than now or about the same?

1 Better off
2 Worse off
3 About the same
4 (DK)
5 (Refused)

17 ____ (429)

(GO TO DEMOGRAPHICS)

INTERVIEWER I.D.# ____ (241) ____ (242) ____ (243) ____ (244)

PART III. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS

The frequency distributions of the responses for the national survey, the African American survey, the Caucasian American survey, the Hispanic American survey, and the opinion leaders survey are presented on the following pages. Please note that the Gallup Organization formatted the response categories to the role evaluation questions as follows: 1 = very important; 2 = moderately important; 3 = slightly important; and 4 = not important. We recoded these response categories so that the higher the code the higher the evaluation of the importance of the role. The mean scores for the role evaluations that appear in the final report were calculated with these recoded response categories.

```
NATIONAL SAMPLE

ARE        REGION OF COUNTRY


                                                     Valid      Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NORTHEAST                       1        211     21.1     21.1     21.1
SOUTH CENTRAL                   2        339     33.9     33.9     54.9
NORTH CENTRAL                   3        249     24.9     24.9     79.8
WEST                            4        202     20.2     20.2    100.0
                                      -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     1001      Missing cases       0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

ASEX       GENDER OF RESPONDENT


                                                     Valid      Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

MALE                            1        474     47.3     47.3     47.3
FEMALE                          2        527     52.7     52.7    100.0
                                      -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     1001      Missing cases       0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

ASTR       SIZE OF COMMUNITY


                                                     Valid      Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

OVER 1,000,000                  1         67      6.7      6.7      6.7
250,000-1,000,000               2        116     11.6     11.6     18.3
UNDER 250,000                   3        817     81.7     81.7    100.0
                                      -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     1001      Missing cases       0
```

AGE AGE OF RESPONDENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	18	10	1.0	1.0	1.0
	19	23	2.2	2.3	3.3
	20	11	1.1	1.1	4.5
	21	25	2.5	2.5	7.0
	22	21	2.1	2.1	9.1
	23	20	2.0	2.0	11.1
	24	11	1.1	1.1	12.1
	25	20	2.0	2.0	14.2
	26	21	2.1	2.1	16.3
	27	9	.9	.9	17.2
	28	22	2.2	2.2	19.4
	29	27	2.7	2.7	22.1
	30	26	2.6	2.6	24.7
	31	25	2.5	2.5	27.2
	32	24	2.4	2.5	29.7
	33	25	2.5	2.5	32.2
	34	31	3.1	3.2	35.4
	35	34	3.4	3.4	38.8
	36	18	1.8	1.9	40.7
	37	23	2.3	2.3	42.9
	38	20	2.0	2.0	44.9
	39	11	1.1	1.1	46.1
	40	28	2.8	2.9	48.9
	41	18	1.8	1.8	50.7
	42	22	2.2	2.2	53.0
	43	15	1.5	1.5	54.5
	44	14	1.4	1.5	55.9
	45	22	2.2	2.2	58.1
	46	20	2.0	2.1	60.2
	47	12	1.2	1.2	61.5
	48	10	1.0	1.0	62.5
	49	16	1.6	1.6	64.1
	50	11	1.1	1.1	65.3
	51	17	1.7	1.7	66.9
	52	10	1.0	1.1	68.0
	53	17	1.7	1.7	69.7
	54	7	.7	.7	70.4
	55	12	1.2	1.2	71.6
	56	11	1.1	1.1	72.7
	57	10	1.0	1.0	73.7
	58	6	.6	.6	74.3
	59	11	1.1	1.2	75.4
	60	14	1.4	1.4	76.9
	61	9	.9	.9	77.7
	62	13	1.3	1.3	79.0
	63	10	1.0	1.0	80.1
	64	11	1.1	1.1	81.2
	65	15	1.5	1.6	82.7
	66	3	.3	.3	83.0
	67	12	1.2	1.2	84.3
	68	10	1.0	1.0	85.3
	69	13	1.3	1.3	86.6
	70	12	1.2	1.2	87.9
	71	14	1.4	1.5	89.3
	72	10	1.0	1.0	90.3
	73	11	1.1	1.1	91.4

NATIONAL SAMPLE

```
AGE        AGE OF RESPONDENT - continued

                                  74          8        .8        .8      92.2
                                  75         12       1.2       1.2      93.3
                                  76          6        .6        .6      93.9
                                  77         11       1.1       1.1      95.1
                                  78          9        .9        .9      96.0
                                  79          3        .3        .3      96.3
                                  80          5        .5        .5      96.8
                                  81          7        .7        .7      97.5
                                  82         11       1.1       1.1      98.6
                                  83          2        .2        .2      98.8
                                  84          4        .4        .4      99.2
                                  85          1        .1        .1      99.2
                                  86          3        .3        .3      99.5
                                  87          3        .3        .3      99.8
                                  89          1        .1        .1      99.9
                                  90          1        .1        .1      99.9
                                  91          1        .1        .1     100.0
                                   .         10       1.0   Missing
                                        -------   -------   -------
                               Total       1001     100.0     100.0

Valid cases      991      Missing cases      10

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D2         HISPANIC OR LATINO DESCENT

                                                            Valid       Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency   Percent   Percent   Percent

YES                                1         41       4.1       4.1       4.1
NO                                 2        955      95.5      95.9     100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  4          4        .4   Missing
                                        -------   -------   -------
                               Total       1001     100.0     100.0

Valid cases      997      Missing cases       4

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D3         SPECIFIC HISPANIC DESCENT

                                                            Valid       Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency   Percent   Percent   Percent

MEXICAN                            1         10       1.0      23.6      23.6
MEXICAN AMERICAN                   2         17       1.7      41.0      64.6
PUERTO RICAN                       3          4        .4      11.0      75.6
OTHER                              5         10       1.0      24.4     100.0
                                   .        960      95.9   Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  7          1        .1   Missing
                                        -------   -------   -------
                               Total       1001     100.0     100.0

Valid cases       41      Missing cases     960
```

```
D4        RACE OF RESPONDENT

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

WHITE                             6        863     86.2     86.7     86.7
BLACK                             7         79      7.9      7.9     94.6
AMERICAN INDIAN                   8         11      1.1      1.1     95.7
ASIAN/PACIFIC ISL                 9         13      1.3      1.3     97.0
HISPANIC/MEXICAN                 12         20      2.0      2.0     99.1
OTHER                            13          9       .9       .9    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 3          6       .6  Missing
                                        -------  -------  -------
                              Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      995      Missing cases       6

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D5        EDUCATION LEVEL COMPLETED

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

KINDERGARTEN OR LESS              4          1       .1       .1       .1
1ST GRADE                         6          3       .3       .3       .4
2ND GRADE                         7          1       .1       .1       .5
3RD GRADE                         8         13      1.3      1.3      1.8
4TH GRADE                         9          5       .5       .5      2.3
5TH GRADE                        10          2       .2       .2      2.5
6TH GRADE                        11          5       .5       .5      3.0
7TH GRADE                        12         15      1.5      1.5      4.4
8TH GRADE                        13         30      3.0      3.0      7.4
9TH GRADE                        14         28      2.8      2.8     10.2
10TH GRADE                       15         43      4.3      4.3     14.5
11TH GRADE                       16         35      3.5      3.5     18.0
12TH GRADE                       17        383     38.3     38.4     56.4
SOME COLLEGE                     18        174     17.4     17.5     73.9
ASSOCIATE DEGREE                 19         38      3.8      3.8     77.7
BACHELORS DEGREE                 20        144     14.4     14.4     92.1
MASTERS DEGREE                   21         45      4.5      4.5     96.7
PROFESSIONAL DEGREE              22         23      2.3      2.3     98.9
DOCTORAL DEGREE                  23         11      1.1      1.1    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                99          4       .4  Missing
                                        -------  -------  -------
                              Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      997      Missing cases       4
```

NATIONAL SAMPLE

```
D6        HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                             1        400     39.9     71.1     71.1
NO                              2        163     16.3     28.9    100.0
                                .        438     43.8  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     563      Missing cases    438

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D7        IF ASSOCIATE DEGREE, TYPE OF PROGRAM

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM            1         14      1.4     36.4     36.4
ACADEMIC PROGRAM                2         24      2.4     63.6    100.0
                                .        963     96.2  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               4          1       .1  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      37      Missing cases    964

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D8        MARITAL STATUS

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

MARRIED                         1        590     58.9     59.2     59.2
WIDOWED                         2         99      9.9     10.0     69.2
DIVORCED                        3        104     10.4     10.4     79.6
NEVER MARRIED                   4        203     20.3     20.4    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               6          5       .5  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     996      Missing cases      5
```

```
D9        IF MARRIED, LIVING WITH SPOUSE

                                                   Valid     Cum
Value Label              Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                          1        568     56.8     96.5     96.5
NO                           2         21      2.1      3.5    100.0
                             .        411     41.1  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED            4          1       .1  Missing
                                  -------  -------  -------
                         Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     589     Missing cases    412

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D10       NUMBER OF PEOPLE LIVING IN YOUR HOME

                                                   Valid     Cum
Value Label              Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

                             1        173     17.3     17.5     17.5
                             2        333     33.3     33.7     51.1
                             3        181     18.0     18.3     69.4
                             4        182     18.2     18.4     87.8
                             5         82      8.2      8.3     96.1
                             6         30      3.0      3.0     99.1
                             7          4       .4       .4     99.6
                             8          1       .1       .1     99.6
                             9          3       .3       .3     99.9
                            12          1       .1       .1    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED           99         12      1.2  Missing
                                  -------  -------  -------
                         Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     989     Missing cases     12

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D11       NUMBER OF PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN IN HOME

                                                   Valid     Cum
Value Label              Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NONE                         0        633     63.2     78.0     78.0
                             1        106     10.6     13.1     91.1
                             2         60      6.0      7.4     98.5
                             3          6       .6       .8     99.3
                             4          6       .6       .7    100.0
                             .        185     18.4  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED           99          5       .5  Missing
                                  -------  -------  -------
                         Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     812     Missing cases    189
```

```
D12       NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN HOME

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NONE                              0        444     44.4     54.6     54.6
                                  1        194     19.3     23.8     78.4
                                  2        128     12.7     15.7     94.1
                                  3         33      3.3      4.1     98.2
                                  4          9       .9      1.1     99.3
                                  5          4       .4       .4     99.7
                                  6          2       .2       .2     99.9
                                 12          1       .1       .1    100.0
                                  .        185     18.4  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                99          3       .3  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     813      Missing cases     188

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D13       WHETHER RESPONDENT IS A STUDENT

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                               1        103     10.3     10.3     10.3
NO                                2        894     89.3     89.7    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 4          4       .4  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     997      Missing cases       4

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D14       IF STUDENT, TYPE OF PROGRAM

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

HS OR EQUIVALENT                  1          9       .9      9.1      9.1
TRAINING PROGRAM                  2         11      1.1     11.0     20.0
COLLEGE                           3         52      5.2     50.9     71.0
GRADUATE/PROF SCHOOL              4         20      2.0     19.5     90.4
OTHER                             5         10      1.0      9.6    100.0
                                  .        898     89.7  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     103      Missing cases     898
```

```
D15       PRIMARY LANGUAGE SPOKEN IN HOUSEHOLD

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

ENGLISH                         6        974     97.3     97.7     97.7
SPANISH                         7          6       .6       .6     98.2
ENGLISH/SPANISH                 8          4       .4       .4     98.7
SOUTHEAST ASIAN                 9          4       .4       .4     99.1
OTHER                          11          9       .9       .9    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               3          4       .4  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     997      Missing cases       4

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D16       CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

EMPLOYED FULL-TIME              1        518     51.8     52.1     52.1
EMPLOYED PART-TIME              2        126     12.6     12.7     64.8
UNEMPLOYED                      3         66      6.6      6.7     71.5
RETIRED                         4        200     20.0     20.1     91.6
NOT IN WORK FORCE               5         83      8.3      8.4    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               7          7       .7  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     994      Missing cases       7
```

NATIONAL SAMPLE

```
D17       ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME BEFORE TAXES

                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                     Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

UNDER $5,000                        1         18      1.8      2.1      2.1
$5,000 TO $9,999                    2         47      4.7      5.5      7.6
$10,000 TO $14,999                  3         75      7.5      8.8     16.4
$15,000 TO $19,999                  4         77      7.6      9.0     25.3
$20,000 TO $24,999                  5         83      8.2      9.7     35.0
$25,000 TO $29,999                  6        113     11.2     13.2     48.2
$30,000 TO $34,999                  7         79      7.9      9.2     57.4
$35,000 TO $39,999                  8         92      9.2     10.8     68.2
$40,000 TO $44,999                  9         52      5.2      6.1     74.3
$45,000 TO $49,999                 10         46      4.6      5.3     79.7
$50,000 TO $54,999                 11         37      3.7      4.3     84.0
$55,000 TO $59,999                 12         20      2.0      2.3     86.4
$60,000 TO $64,999                 13         24      2.4      2.8     89.1
$65,000 TO $69,999                 14         11      1.1      1.3     90.5
$70,000 TO $74,999                 15         12      1.2      1.4     91.9
$75,000 OR MORE                    16         69      6.9      8.1    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  18        147     14.7  Missing
                                         -------  -------  -------
                                Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     853      Missing cases    147

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D21       DISABLED PERSON IN HOUSEHOLD

                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                     Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                                 1        144     14.4     14.7     14.7
NO                                  2        836     83.5     85.3    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                   4         21      2.1  Missing
                                         -------  -------  -------
                                Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     980      Missing cases     21

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D22       WHO IN HOUSEHOLD HAS DISABILITY

                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                     Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

RESPONDENT                          1         78      7.8     54.3     54.3
SOMEONE ELSE                        2         55      5.5     38.5     92.8
BOTH                                3         10      1.0      7.2    100.0
                                    .        857     85.6  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                   5          1       .1  Missing
                                         -------  -------  -------
                                Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     143      Missing cases    857
```

```
D23       FUNCTION AFFECTED BY DISABILITY

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

SEEING                          1         10      1.0     11.6     11.6
HEARING                         2          6       .6      6.4     18.0
WALKING                         3         49      4.9     56.1     74.0
MENTAL FUNCTIONING              5          4       .4      4.2     78.2
SOMETHING ELSE                  6         19      1.9     21.8    100.0
                                .        913     91.2  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               8          1       .1  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      88      Missing cases    913

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q1        VOTED IN 1988 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                             1        628     62.8     63.2     63.2
NO                              2        366     36.5     36.8    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               4          7       .7  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     994      Missing cases      7

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q2        GONE TO PUBLIC LIBRARY IN LAST YEAR

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                             1        572     57.1     57.5     57.5
NO                              2        423     42.3     42.5    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               4          6       .6  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     994      Missing cases      6
```

```
NATIONAL SAMPLE

Q2A       FREQUENCY OF LIBRARY VISITS IN LAST YEAR

                                                   Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

1 TO 5 TIMES                    1        246     24.5     43.3     43.3
6 TO 10 TIMES                   2        109     10.9     19.3     62.6
11 TO 15 TIMES                  3         60      6.0     10.5     73.1
16 TO 20 TIMES                  4         31      3.1      5.4     78.6
21 TO 25 TIMES                  5         22      2.2      3.9     82.5
26 TIMES OR MORE                6         99      9.9     17.5    100.0
                                .        429     42.9  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               8          5       .5  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     567      Missing cases    434

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q3        HAS ANYONE GONE TO LIBRARY FOR YOU

                                                   Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                             1        214     21.4     21.5     21.5
NO                              2        785     78.4     78.5    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               4          2       .2  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     999      Missing cases      2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q4        HAVE YOU CALLED LIBRARY FOR INFORMATION

                                                   Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                             1        232     23.1     23.2     23.2
NO                              2        768     76.8     76.8    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               4          1       .1  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases    1000      Missing cases      1
```

```
USE       ANY USE OF PUBLIC LIBRARY IN LAST YEAR

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NO                             0        367     36.7     36.7     36.7
YES                            1        634     63.3     63.3    100.0
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     1001      Missing cases       0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q5        FORMAL EDUCATION SUPPORT CENTER

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                  1         14      1.4      1.4      1.4
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT             2         12      1.2      1.2      2.6
MODERATELY IMPORTANT           3         86      8.6      8.7     11.3
VERY IMPORTANT                 4        881     88.1     88.7    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              6          8       .8  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      993      Missing cases       8

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q6        PRESCHOOLERS DOOR TO LEARNING

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                  1          7       .7       .7       .7
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT             2         20      2.0      2.0      2.7
MODERATELY IMPORTANT           3        131     13.1     13.2     15.9
VERY IMPORTANT                 4        833     83.2     84.1    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              6         10      1.0  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      990      Missing cases      10
```

NATIONAL SAMPLE

```
Q7       REFERENCE LIBRARY/PERSONAL INFORMATION

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                   1         22      2.2      2.2      2.2
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT              2         56      5.6      5.7      7.8
MODERATELY IMPORTANT            3        432     43.2     43.5     51.3
VERY IMPORTANT                  4        484     48.4     48.7    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               6          6       .6  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     995      Missing cases       6

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q8       REFERENCE LIBRARY FOR BUSINESSES

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                   1         26      2.6      2.7      2.7
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT              2         92      9.2      9.5     12.1
MODERATELY IMPORTANT            3        302     30.1     31.1     43.2
VERY IMPORTANT                  4        552     55.1     56.8    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               6         30      3.0  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     971      Missing cases      30

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q9       COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTER

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                   1         79      7.9      8.0      8.0
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT              2        128     12.7     13.0     21.0
MODERATELY IMPORTANT            3        361     36.1     36.8     57.8
VERY IMPORTANT                  4        414     41.3     42.2    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               6         20      2.0  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     981      Missing cases      20
```

```
Q10       RESEARCH CENTER

                                                                Valid     Cum
Value Label                        Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                          1         20      2.0      2.1      2.1
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                     2         64      6.4      6.5      8.6
MODERATELY IMPORTANT                   3        214     21.4     21.8     30.4
VERY IMPORTANT                         4        682     68.2     69.6    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                      6         20      2.0  Missing
                                             -------  -------  -------
                                   Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     981      Missing cases      20

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q11       COMMUNITY INFORMATION CENTER

                                                                Valid     Cum
Value Label                        Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                          1         17      1.7      1.8      1.8
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                     2         49      4.9      4.9      6.7
MODERATELY IMPORTANT                   3        263     26.3     26.7     33.4
VERY IMPORTANT                         4        657     65.6     66.6    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                      6         14      1.4  Missing
                                             -------  -------  -------
                                   Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     987      Missing cases      14

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q12       INDEPENDENT LEARNING CENTER

                                                                Valid     Cum
Value Label                        Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                          1          9       .9       .9       .9
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                     2         21      2.1      2.1      3.0
MODERATELY IMPORTANT                   3        117     11.7     11.7     14.8
VERY IMPORTANT                         4        847     84.6     85.2    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                      6          7       .7  Missing
                                             -------  -------  -------
                                   Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     993      Missing cases       7
```

NATIONAL SAMPLE

Q13 PUBLIC WORK PLACE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT IMPORTANT	1	33	3.3	3.3	3.3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	2	85	8.5	8.6	11.9
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3	348	34.7	35.1	47.0
VERY IMPORTANT	4	525	52.4	53.0	100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED	6	11	1.1	Missing	
	Total	1001	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 990 Missing cases 11

- -

Q14 POPULAR MATERIALS LIBRARY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT IMPORTANT	1	35	3.5	3.5	3.5
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	2	96	9.5	9.7	13.2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT	3	344	34.4	34.8	48.0
VERY IMPORTANT	4	515	51.4	52.0	100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED	6	12	1.2	Missing	
	Total	1001	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 989 Missing cases 12

- -

Q15 SUGGESTED ANNUAL SPENDING PER PERSON

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
$0	0	3	.3	.4	.4
$1 TO $20	10	348	34.8	39.8	40.1
$21 TO $40	30	257	25.7	29.3	69.5
$41 TO $60	50	127	12.7	14.5	84.0
$61 TO $80	70	54	5.4	6.2	90.2
$81 TO $100	90	42	4.2	4.8	95.0
MORE THAN $100	110	44	4.4	5.0	100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED	9	125	12.5	Missing	
	Total	1001	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 876 Missing cases 125

```
Q16       FINANCIAL SITUATION COMPARED TO LAST YR

                                                           Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

BETTER OFF                         1        252     25.1     25.4     25.4
WORSE OFF                          2        233     23.3     23.5     48.9
ABOUT THE SAME                     3        507     50.6     51.1    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  5         10      1.0  Missing
                                        -------  -------  -------
                               Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     991      Missing cases     10
```

- -

```
Q17       FINANCIAL SITUATION COMPARED TO NEXT YR

                                                           Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

BETTER OFF                         1        456     45.6     47.6     47.6
WORSE OFF                          2         77      7.7      8.0     55.6
ABOUT THE SAME                     3        426     42.6     44.4    100.0
RA                                 5         41      4.1  Missing
                                        -------  -------  -------
                               Total       1001    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     959      Missing cases     41
```

```
ARE      REGION OF COUNTRY

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NORTHEAST                          1         82     20.4     20.4     20.4
SOUTH CENTRAL                      2        206     51.5     51.5     71.9
NORTH CENTRAL                      3         77     19.3     19.3     91.2
WEST                               4         35      8.8      8.8    100.0
                                           -------  -------  -------
                                   Total    401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     401      Missing cases       0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

ASEX     GENDER OF RESPONDENT

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

MALE                               1        177     44.1     44.1     44.1
FEMALE                             2        224     55.9     55.9    100.0
                                           -------  -------  -------
                                   Total    401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     401      Missing cases       0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

ASTR     % OF COMMUNITY WHICH IS BLACK

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

HIGH 26%-100%                      1        216     54.0     54.0     54.0
MODERATE 5%-25%                    2        118     29.6     29.6     83.5
LOW 0%-4%                          3         66     16.5     16.5    100.0
                                           -------  -------  -------
                                   Total    401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     401      Missing cases       0
```

AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

AGE AGE OF RESPONDENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	18	2	.4	.4	.4
	19	6	1.6	1.6	2.0
	20	6	1.5	1.5	3.5
	21	12	2.9	2.9	6.4
	22	13	3.2	3.3	9.7
	23	15	3.8	3.8	13.5
	24	13	3.3	3.3	16.8
	25	15	3.6	3.7	20.5
	26	5	1.2	1.2	21.7
	27	4	.9	.9	22.5
	28	20	5.0	5.0	27.6
	29	7	1.9	1.9	29.4
	30	13	3.2	3.3	32.7
	31	6	1.5	1.5	34.2
	32	12	3.1	3.1	37.3
	33	6	1.5	1.5	38.8
	34	13	3.3	3.3	42.1
	35	9	2.3	2.3	44.4
	36	10	2.6	2.6	47.1
	37	11	2.7	2.8	49.8
	38	14	3.5	3.5	53.4
	39	2	.5	.5	53.9
	40	13	3.3	3.4	57.3
	41	2	.5	.5	57.8
	42	6	1.5	1.5	59.3
	43	3	.7	.7	60.0
	44	5	1.3	1.3	61.3
	45	15	3.7	3.7	65.0
	46	3	.6	.6	65.7
	47	11	2.7	2.7	68.4
	48	4	.9	.9	69.3
	49	4	1.1	1.1	70.4
	50	4	.9	.9	71.3
	51	2	.4	.4	71.7
	52	6	1.4	1.5	73.2
	53	2	.5	.5	73.7
	54	4	1.1	1.1	74.8
	55	3	.7	.8	75.6
	56	6	1.4	1.4	77.0
	57	2	.5	.5	77.5
	58	4	1.0	1.0	78.5
	59	1	.3	.3	78.8
	60	2	.5	.5	79.3
	61	3	.9	.9	80.2
	62	3	.7	.7	80.9
	63	2	.4	.4	81.3
	64	3	.7	.7	82.0
	65	2	.4	.4	82.5
	66	1	.3	.3	82.7
	67	19	4.8	4.8	87.5
	68	1	.2	.2	87.7
	69	1	.1	.1	87.8
	70	5	1.2	1.2	89.0
	71	1	.3	.3	89.4
	72	0	.1	.1	89.5
	73	1	.2	.2	89.7

```
AGE       AGE OF RESPONDENT - continued

                              74        4       .9       .9     90.6
                              75        3       .8       .8     91.4
                              76        3       .7       .7     92.1
                              77        1       .2       .2     92.3
                              78        1       .3       .3     92.6
                              80        1       .3       .3     92.9
                              81        2       .4       .4     93.3
                              82       24      6.0      6.0     99.3
                              83        0       .1       .1     99.4
                              84        1       .1       .1     99.5
                              85        0       .1       .1     99.6
                              92        1       .4       .4    100.0
                               .        4       .9  Missing
                                  -------  -------  -------
                           Total      401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     397      Missing cases      4

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D2        HISPANIC OR LATINO DESCENT

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                            1        2       .4       .4       .4
NO                             2      398     99.4     99.6    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              4        1       .2  Missing
                                  -------  -------  -------
                           Total      401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     400      Missing cases      1

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D3        SPECIFIC HISPANIC DESCENT

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

MEXICAN AMERICAN               2        0       .1     24.6     24.6
PUERTO RICAN                   3        1       .2     45.3     69.8
OTHER                          5        1       .1     30.2    100.0
                               .      399     99.6  Missing
                                  -------  -------  -------
                           Total      401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases       2      Missing cases    399
```

AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
D4        RACE OF RESPONDENT


                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

BLACK                           7        401    100.0    100.0    100.0
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     401      Missing cases      0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D5        EDUCATION LEVEL COMPLETED


                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

KINDERGARTEN OR LESS            4          1       .1       .1       .1
1ST GRADE                       6          4       .9      1.0      1.1
2ND GRADE                       7          1       .3       .3      1.4
3RD GRADE                       8         19      4.6      4.6      6.1
4TH GRADE                       9          2       .4       .4      6.5
5TH GRADE                      10          2       .5       .5      7.0
6TH GRADE                      11          6      1.4      1.4      8.4
7TH GRADE                      12         30      7.4      7.4     15.8
8TH GRADE                      13          9      2.2      2.2     18.0
9TH GRADE                      14          6      1.5      1.5     19.5
10TH GRADE                     15         28      6.9      6.9     26.4
11TH GRADE                     16         25      6.3      6.3     32.7
12TH GRADE                     17        151     37.7     37.9     70.6
SOME COLLEGE                   18         59     14.6     14.7     85.3
ASSOCIATE DEGREE               19         12      3.1      3.1     88.3
BACHELORS DEGREE               20         32      8.0      8.0     96.3
MASTERS DEGREE                 21         10      2.6      2.6     99.0
PROFESSIONAL DEGREE            22          3       .8       .8     99.8
DOCTORAL DEGREE                23          0       .1       .1     99.8
OTHER                          24          1       .2       .2    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              99          2       .4   Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     399      Missing cases      2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D6        HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA


                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                             1        153     38.1     54.2     54.2
NO                              2        129     32.2     45.8    100.0
                                .        119     29.8   Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     281      Missing cases    119
```

```
D7        IF ASSOCIATE DEGREE, TYPE OF PROGRAM

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM              1          7      1.9     60.7     60.7
ACADEMIC PROGRAM                  2          5      1.2     39.3    100.0
                                  .        388     96.9  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      12      Missing cases    388

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D8        MARITAL STATUS

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

MARRIED                           1        164     40.9     41.1     41.1
WIDOWED                           2         51     12.8     12.8     54.0
DIVORCED                          3         70     17.4     17.5     71.5
NEVER MARRIED                     4        114     28.4     28.5    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 6          2       .5  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     398      Missing cases      2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D9        IF MARRIED, LIVING WITH SPOUSE

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                               1        141     35.3     86.3     86.3
NO                                2         23      5.6     13.7    100.0
                                  .        237     59.1  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     164      Missing cases    237
```

AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
D10       NUMBER OF PEOPLE LIVING IN YOUR HOME

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

                                 1        66     16.5     16.6     16.6
                                 2       111     27.8     28.0     44.5
                                 3        88     22.0     22.2     66.7
                                 4        67     16.8     17.0     83.7
                                 5        41     10.4     10.4     94.1
                                 6        13      3.2      3.3     97.3
                                 7         4      1.0      1.0     98.3
                                 8         1       .1       .1     98.5
                                 9         4       .9       .9     99.4
                                10         2       .4       .4     99.8
                                16         1       .2       .2    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               99         3       .7  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                             Total       401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     398      Missing cases      3
```

- -

```
D11       NUMBER OF PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN IN HOME

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NONE                             0       231     57.8     71.0     71.0
                                 1        77     19.2     23.6     94.6
                                 2        11      2.8      3.4     98.0
                                 3         3       .8      1.0     99.0
                                 4         3       .8      1.0    100.0
                                 .        69     17.2  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               99         6      1.5  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                             Total       401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     326      Missing cases     75
```

```
D12       NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN HOME

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NONE                            0       153     38.3     46.4     46.4
                                1       110     27.5     33.4     79.8
                                2        40     10.0     12.1     91.8
                                3        17      4.2      5.1     97.0
                                4         4      1.1      1.4     98.3
                                5         3       .7       .9     99.2
                                6         2       .4       .5     99.7
                                9         1       .2       .3    100.0
                                .        69     17.2  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              99         1       .4  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                            Total       401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     330      Missing cases     70
```

```
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D13       WHETHER RESPONDENT IS A STUDENT

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                             1        47     11.7     11.8     11.8
NO                              2       352     87.8     88.2    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               4         2       .5  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                            Total       401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     399      Missing cases      2
```

```
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D14       IF STUDENT, TYPE OF PROGRAM

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

HS OR EQUIVALENT                1         3       .7      6.1      6.1
TRAINING PROGRAM                2         6      1.5     12.5     18.6
COLLEGE                         3        23      5.7     49.2     67.8
GRADUATE/PROF SCHOOL            4         4      1.0      8.2     75.9
OTHER                           5        11      2.8     24.1    100.0
                                .       354     88.3  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               7         0       .1  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                            Total       401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      47      Missing cases    354
```

AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
D15       PRIMARY LANGUAGE SPOKEN IN HOUSEHOLD

                                                          Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

ENGLISH                           6        396     98.9     99.3     99.3
SPANISH                           7          0       .1       .1     99.4
ENGLISH/SPANISH                   8          1       .2       .2     99.6
OTHER                            11          1       .4       .4    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 3          2       .4  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      399      Missing cases       2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D16       CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS

                                                          Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

EMPLOYED FULL-TIME                1        189     47.1     47.4     47.4
EMPLOYED PART-TIME                2         47     11.8     11.9     59.3
UNEMPLOYED                        3         63     15.7     15.8     75.0
RETIRED                           4         63     15.7     15.8     90.8
NOT IN WORK FORCE                 5         37      9.2      9.2    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 7          2       .6  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      398      Missing cases       2
```

```
D17      ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME BEFORE TAXES

                                                          Valid      Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

UNDER $5,000                       1        59     14.7     16.2     16.2
$5,000 TO $9,999                   2        48     11.9     13.1     29.3
$10,000 TO $14,999                 3        45     11.3     12.5     41.9
$15,000 TO $19,999                 4        41     10.1     11.2     53.0
$20,000 TO $24,999                 5        31      7.8      8.6     61.7
$25,000 TO $29,999                 6        31      7.9      8.7     70.3
$30,000 TO $34,999                 7        14      3.6      4.0     74.3
$35,000 TO $39,999                 8        36      8.9      9.8     84.1
$40,000 TO $44,999                 9         8      1.9      2.1     86.2
$45,000 TO $49,999                10         9      2.2      2.4     88.6
$50,000 TO $54,999                11         8      2.1      2.3     90.9
$55,000 TO $59,999                12         9      2.2      2.4     93.3
$60,000 TO $64,999                13         7      1.7      1.9     95.2
$65,000 TO $69,999                14         3       .7       .8     96.0
$70,000 TO $74,999                15         4      1.0      1.1     97.0
$75,000 OR MORE                   16        11      2.7      3.0    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 18        37      9.3  Missing
                                        -------  -------  -------
                               Total       401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     363      Missing cases      37

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D21      DISABLED PERSON IN HOUSEHOLD

                                                          Valid      Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                                1        87     21.6     22.0     22.0
NO                                 2       307     76.7     78.0    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  4         7      1.7  Missing
                                        -------  -------  -------
                               Total       401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     394      Missing cases       7

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D22      WHO IN HOUSEHOLD HAS DISABILITY

                                                          Valid      Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

RESPONDENT                         1        23      5.7     26.2     26.2
SOMEONE ELSE                       2        60     15.0     69.3     95.5
BOTH                               3         4      1.0      4.5    100.0
                                   .       314     78.4  Missing
                                        -------  -------  -------
                               Total       401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      87      Missing cases     314
```

AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
D23       FUNCTION AFFECTED BY DISABILITY

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label               Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

SEEING                        1          4      1.0     15.6     15.6
HEARING                       2          1       .2      2.5     18.1
WALKING                       3         17      4.3     66.5     84.6
MENTAL FUNCTIONING            5          1       .1      2.1     86.8
SOMETHING ELSE                6          3       .8     13.2    100.0
                              .        374     93.4  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED             8          1       .2  Missing
                                   -------  -------  -------
                          Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      26      Missing cases     375

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q1        VOTED IN 1988 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label               Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                           1        210     52.4     52.4     52.4
NO                            2        191     47.6     47.6    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED             4          0       .1  Missing
                                   -------  -------  -------
                          Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     400      Missing cases       0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q2        GONE TO PUBLIC LIBRARY IN LAST YEAR

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label               Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                           1        205     51.1     51.1     51.1
NO                            2        196     48.9     48.9    100.0
                                   -------  -------  -------
                          Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     401      Missing cases       0
```

```
Q2A       FREQUENCY OF LIBRARY VISITS IN LAST YEAR

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

1 TO 5 TIMES                   1         95     23.8     46.6     46.6
6 TO 10 TIMES                  2         38      9.4     18.4     65.0
11 TO 15 TIMES                 3         15      3.8      7.4     72.4
16 TO 20 TIMES                 4          9      2.1      4.2     76.6
21 TO 25 TIMES                 5          9      2.3      4.4     81.0
26 TIMES OR MORE               6         39      9.7     19.0    100.0
                               .        196     48.9  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     205      Missing cases     196

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q3        HAS ANYONE GONE TO LIBRARY FOR YOU

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                            1         54     13.4     13.5     13.5
NO                             2        344     86.0     86.5    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              4          3       .7  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     398      Missing cases       3

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q4        HAVE YOU CALLED LIBRARY FOR INFORMATION

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                            1         63     15.8     15.8     15.8
NO                             2        337     84.2     84.2    100.0
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     401      Missing cases       0
```

AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
USE       ANY USE OF PUBLIC LIBRARY IN LAST YEAR

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent   Percent  Percent

NO                             0        183     45.7      45.7     45.7
YES                            1        217     54.3      54.3    100.0
                                    -------  -------   -------
                             Total      401    100.0     100.0

Valid cases     401      Missing cases       0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q5        FORMAL EDUCATION SUPPORT CENTER

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent   Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                  1          1       .3        .4       .4
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT             2          6      1.5       1.5      1.8
MODERATELY IMPORTANT           3          7      1.7       1.7      3.5
VERY IMPORTANT                 4        385     96.1      96.5    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              6          2       .4   Missing
                                    -------  -------   -------
                             Total      401    100.0     100.0

Valid cases     399      Missing cases       2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q6        PRESCHOOLERS DOOR TO LEARNING

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent   Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                  1          2       .4        .4       .4
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT             2          3       .7        .7      1.1
MODERATELY IMPORTANT           3         13      3.2       3.2      4.3
VERY IMPORTANT                 4        382     95.3      95.7    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              6          2       .4   Missing
                                    -------  -------   -------
                             Total      401    100.0     100.0

Valid cases     399      Missing cases       2
```

```
Q7        REFERENCE LIBRARY/PERSONAL INFORMATION

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                   1          6      1.6      1.6      1.6
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT              2          7      1.8      1.8      3.5
MODERATELY IMPORTANT            3         86     21.5     21.7     25.2
VERY IMPORTANT                  4        296     74.0     74.8    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               6          4      1.0  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     396      Missing cases      4

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q8        REFERENCE LIBRARY FOR BUSINESSES

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                   1          3       .7       .7       .7
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT              2         16      3.9      3.9      4.7
MODERATELY IMPORTANT            3         66     16.4     16.5     21.1
VERY IMPORTANT                  4        315     78.5     78.9    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               6          2       .4  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     399      Missing cases      2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q9        COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTER

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                   1         10      2.5      2.6      2.6
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT              2         36      9.0      9.1     11.7
MODERATELY IMPORTANT            3         97     24.3     24.5     36.2
VERY IMPORTANT                  4        253     63.1     63.8    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               6          4      1.1  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     396      Missing cases      4
```

AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
Q10       RESEARCH CENTER


                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                      1          6      1.5      1.5      1.5
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                 2         11      2.7      2.8      4.3
MODERATELY IMPORTANT               3         44     10.9     11.0     15.4
VERY IMPORTANT                     4        336     83.8     84.6    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  6          4      1.0  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                               Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     397      Missing cases       4

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q11       COMMUNITY INFORMATION CENTER


                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                      1          3       .7       .7       .7
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                 2          8      1.9      1.9      2.6
MODERATELY IMPORTANT               3         47     11.8     11.8     14.4
VERY IMPORTANT                     4        341     85.2     85.6    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  6          2       .4  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                               Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     399      Missing cases       2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q12       INDEPENDENT LEARNING CENTER


                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                      1          3       .8       .8       .8
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                 2          8      2.0      2.0      2.9
MODERATELY IMPORTANT               3         16      4.0      4.1      6.9
VERY IMPORTANT                     4        371     92.6     93.1    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  6          2       .5  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                               Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     398      Missing cases       2
```

```
Q13      PUBLIC WORK PLACE

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                     1          4       .9       .9       .9
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                2         17      4.2      4.2      5.1
MODERATELY IMPORTANT              3         96     24.0     24.1     29.3
VERY IMPORTANT                    4        282     70.5     70.7    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 6          2       .4  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     399      Missing cases      2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q14      POPULAR MATERIALS LIBRARY

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                     1          8      1.9      2.0      2.0
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                2         23      5.8      5.9      7.8
MODERATELY IMPORTANT              3        122     30.4     30.7     38.5
VERY IMPORTANT                    4        244     61.0     61.5    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 6          3       .8  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     397      Missing cases      3

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q15      SUGGESTED ANNUAL SPENDING PER PERSON

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

$0                                0          9      2.1      2.4      2.4
$1 TO $20                        10        142     35.4     39.7     42.1
$21 TO $40                       30         92     23.0     25.8     67.9
$41 TO $60                       50         21      5.3      5.9     73.8
$61 TO $80                       70         12      2.9      3.3     77.1
$81 TO $100                      90         41     10.1     11.4     88.4
MORE THAN $100                  110         41     10.3     11.6    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 9         43     10.8  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     357      Missing cases     43
```

```
AFRICAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

Q16       FINANCIAL SITUATION COMPARED TO LAST YR

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

BETTER OFF                        1         86     21.5     21.6     21.6
WORSE OFF                         2        137     34.3     34.4     56.0
ABOUT THE SAME                    3        176     43.8     44.0    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 5          2       .4  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     399      Missing cases       2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q17       FINANCIAL SITUATION COMPARED TO NEXT YR

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

BETTER OFF                        1        253     63.2     66.8     66.8
WORSE OFF                         2         20      4.9      5.2     72.1
ABOUT THE SAME                    3        106     26.4     27.9    100.0
RA                                5         22      5.5  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        401    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     379      Missing cases      22
```

```
ARE      REGION OF COUNTRY

                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NORTHEAST                         1        190     22.5     22.5     22.5
SOUTH CENTRAL                     2        264     31.2     31.2     53.7
NORTH CENTRAL                     3        220     26.0     26.0     79.7
WEST                              4        172     20.3     20.3    100.0
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     846      Missing cases      0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

ASEX     GENDER OF RESPONDENT

                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

MALE                              1        401     47.3     47.3     47.3
FEMALE                            2        445     52.7     52.7    100.0
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     846      Missing cases      0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

ASTR     SIZE OF COMMUNITY

                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

OVER 1,000,000                    1         45      5.3      5.3      5.3
250,000-1,000,000                 2         88     10.4     10.4     15.8
UNDER 250,000                     3        713     84.2     84.2    100.0
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     846      Missing cases      0
```

```
CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

AGE       AGE OF RESPONDENT

                                                          Valid      Cum
Value Label                    Value Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

                                  18         8      1.0      1.0      1.0
                                  19        18      2.2      2.2      3.2
                                  20         7       .8       .8      4.0
                                  21        20      2.4      2.4      6.4
                                  22        15      1.8      1.8      8.2
                                  23        11      1.3      1.3      9.5
                                  24         7       .8       .8     10.3
                                  25        16      1.9      1.9     12.2
                                  26        16      1.9      1.9     14.1
                                  27         7       .9       .9     14.9
                                  28        15      1.7      1.7     16.7
                                  29        23      2.7      2.7     19.4
                                  30        23      2.7      2.7     22.1
                                  31        22      2.6      2.6     24.7
                                  32        19      2.3      2.3     27.0
                                  33        23      2.7      2.7     29.8
                                  34        24      2.8      2.8     32.6
                                  35        28      3.4      3.4     36.0
                                  36        18      2.1      2.1     38.1
                                  37        16      1.9      1.9     40.0
                                  38        19      2.2      2.3     42.3
                                  39         9      1.1      1.1     43.3
                                  40        23      2.7      2.8     46.1
                                  41        17      2.0      2.1     48.1
                                  42        18      2.2      2.2     50.3
                                  43        12      1.5      1.5     51.8
                                  44        12      1.4      1.4     53.2
                                  45        21      2.5      2.5     55.7
                                  46        17      2.0      2.1     57.7
                                  47        12      1.4      1.4     59.1
                                  48         9      1.0      1.1     60.2
                                  49        12      1.5      1.5     61.7
                                  50        10      1.1      1.1     62.8
                                  51        13      1.5      1.6     64.4
                                  52        10      1.2      1.2     65.5
                                  53        14      1.7      1.7     67.2
                                  54         7       .8       .8     68.0
                                  55        11      1.3      1.3     69.3
                                  56         9      1.0      1.0     70.3
                                  57        10      1.2      1.2     71.5
                                  58         6       .7       .7     72.3
                                  59        11      1.3      1.3     73.5
                                  60        12      1.4      1.4     75.0
                                  61         9      1.0      1.0     76.0
                                  62        13      1.5      1.5     77.5
                                  63        10      1.2      1.2     78.7
                                  64        10      1.2      1.2     79.9
                                  65        14      1.6      1.6     81.6
                                  66         3       .4       .4     81.9
                                  67        12      1.5      1.5     83.4
                                  68        10      1.2      1.2     84.6
                                  69        13      1.6      1.6     86.2
                                  70        10      1.2      1.2     87.4
                                  71        12      1.5      1.5     88.8
                                  72         9      1.1      1.1     89.9
                                  73         9      1.1      1.1     91.0
```

```
AGE       AGE OF RESPONDENT - continued

                                 74        6       .7       .7     91.7
                                 75       10      1.2      1.2     92.9
                                 76        4       .4       .4     93.3
                                 77       11      1.3      1.4     94.7
                                 78        9      1.1      1.1     95.8
                                 79        3       .4       .4     96.2
                                 80        5       .6       .6     96.8
                                 81        5       .5       .5     97.3
                                 82        9      1.0      1.0     98.3
                                 83        2       .2       .2     98.6
                                 84        4       .4       .5     99.0
                                 85        1       .1       .1     99.1
                                 86        3       .3       .3     99.4
                                 87        3       .4       .4     99.8
                                 89        1       .1       .1     99.8
                                 90        1       .1       .1     99.9
                                 91        1       .1       .1    100.0
                                  .        8       .9  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total      846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     838      Missing cases      8

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D2        HISPANIC OR LATINO DESCENT

                                                        Valid      Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NO                                2        844     99.8     99.8     99.8
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 4          2       .2       .2    100.0
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     846      Missing cases      0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D3        SPECIFIC HISPANIC DESCENT

                                                        Valid      Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

                                  .        846    100.0  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases       0      Missing cases    846
```

CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
D4        RACE OF RESPONDENT

                                                  Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

WHITE                           6        846    100.0    100.0    100.0
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     846      Missing cases      0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D5        EDUCATION LEVEL COMPLETED

                                                  Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

1ST GRADE                       6          2       .2       .2       .2
2ND GRADE                       7          1       .1       .1       .3
3RD GRADE                       8         10      1.2      1.2      1.5
4TH GRADE                       9          3       .3       .3      1.8
5TH GRADE                      10          2       .3       .3      2.1
6TH GRADE                      11          3       .3       .3      2.4
7TH GRADE                      12         15      1.7      1.7      4.2
8TH GRADE                      13         23      2.7      2.7      6.9
9TH GRADE                      14         26      3.1      3.1     10.0
10TH GRADE                     15         36      4.3      4.3     14.3
11TH GRADE                     16         28      3.3      3.3     17.6
12TH GRADE                     17        328     38.8     38.8     56.4
SOME COLLEGE                   18        145     17.2     17.2     73.6
ASSOCIATE DEGREE               19         33      3.9      3.9     77.5
BACHELORS DEGREE               20        128     15.1     15.1     92.6
MASTERS DEGREE                 21         36      4.2      4.3     96.8
PROFESSIONAL DEGREE            22         19      2.3      2.3     99.1
DOCTORAL DEGREE                23          7       .9       .9    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              99          1       .1  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     845      Missing cases      1

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D6        HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA

                                                  Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                             1        346     40.9     72.7     72.7
NO                              2        130     15.4     27.3    100.0
                                .        369     43.7  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     477      Missing cases    369
```

```
D7        IF ASSOCIATE DEGREE, TYPE OF PROGRAM

                                                        Valid    Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM            1        11      1.3     34.0     34.0
ACADEMIC PROGRAM                2        21      2.5     66.0    100.0
                                .       813     96.1   Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               4         1       .1   Missing
                                    -------   -------  -------
                            Total       846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      32      Missing cases    814

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D8        MARITAL STATUS

                                                        Valid    Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

MARRIED                         1       518     61.2     61.3     61.3
WIDOWED                         2        93     11.0     11.0     72.3
DIVORCED                        3        86     10.2     10.2     82.6
NEVER MARRIED                   4       147     17.4     17.4    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               6         2       .2   Missing
                                    -------   -------  -------
                            Total       846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     844      Missing cases      2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D9        IF MARRIED, LIVING WITH SPOUSE

                                                        Valid    Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                             1       503     59.4     97.2     97.2
NO                              2        14      1.7      2.8    100.0
                                .       328     38.8   Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               4         1       .1   Missing
                                    -------   -------  -------
                            Total       846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     517      Missing cases    329
```

CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
D10       NUMBER OF PEOPLE LIVING IN YOUR HOME

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label               Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

                              1       148     17.5     17.6     17.6
                              2       294     34.7     35.0     52.7
                              3       148     17.5     17.6     70.3
                              4       151     17.9     18.0     88.3
                              5        70      8.2      8.3     96.7
                              6        20      2.4      2.4     99.1
                              7         4       .5       .5     99.6
                              8         1       .1       .1     99.7
                              9         2       .2       .2     99.9
                             12         1       .1       .1    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED            99         9      1.0  Missing
                                  -------  -------  -------
                          Total       846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     837      Missing cases       9
```

```
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D11       NUMBER OF PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN IN HOME

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label               Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NONE                          0       537     63.4     78.0     78.0
                              1        87     10.2     12.6     90.6
                              2        56      6.6      8.1     98.7
                              3         5       .6       .7     99.4
                              4         4       .5       .6    100.0
                              .       156     18.5  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED            99         2       .2  Missing
                                  -------  -------  -------
                          Total       846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     688      Missing cases     158
```

```
D12      NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN HOME

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NONE                           0        384     45.4     55.9     55.9
                               1        158     18.7     23.0     78.9
                               2        105     12.4     15.3     94.2
                               3         26      3.1      3.8     98.0
                               4          9      1.1      1.3     99.3
                               5          3       .3       .4     99.7
                               6          2       .2       .2     99.9
                              12          1       .1       .1    100.0
                               .        156     18.5  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED             99          2       .2  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     688      Missing cases    158

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D13      WHETHER RESPONDENT IS A STUDENT

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                            1         84      9.9     10.0     10.0
NO                             2        759     89.7     90.0    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              4          3       .4  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     843      Missing cases      3

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D14      IF STUDENT, TYPE OF PROGRAM

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

HS OR EQUIVALENT               1          8      1.0      9.7      9.7
TRAINING PROGRAM               2         10      1.2     11.8     21.5
COLLEGE                        3         44      5.2     52.3     73.8
GRADUATE/PROF SCHOOL           4         15      1.8     17.7     91.5
OTHER                          5          7       .8      8.5    100.0
                               .        762     90.1  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      84      Missing cases    762
```

CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
D15      PRIMARY LANGUAGE SPOKEN IN HOUSEHOLD

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

ENGLISH                         6        839     99.2     99.4     99.4
OTHER                          11          5       .6       .6    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               3          2       .2  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     844      Missing cases      2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D16      CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

EMPLOYED FULL-TIME              1        431     50.9     51.2     51.2
EMPLOYED PART-TIME              2        102     12.1     12.2     63.4
UNEMPLOYED                      3         55      6.5      6.6     70.0
RETIRED                         4        185     21.9     22.0     92.0
NOT IN WORK FORCE               5         68      8.0      8.0    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               7          5       .6  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     841      Missing cases      5
```

```
D17       ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME BEFORE TAXES

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label               Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

UNDER $5,000                  1        14      1.6      1.9      1.9
$5,000 TO $9,999              2        39      4.6      5.4      7.3
$10,000 TO $14,999            3        58      6.9      8.0     15.3
$15,000 TO $19,999            4        60      7.1      8.3     23.6
$20,000 TO $24,999            5        68      8.1      9.4     33.0
$25,000 TO $29,999            6        92     10.9     12.7     45.7
$30,000 TO $34,999            7        72      8.5      9.9     55.6
$35,000 TO $39,999            8        74      8.7     10.2     65.8
$40,000 TO $44,999            9        49      5.8      6.8     72.6
$45,000 TO $49,999           10        43      5.1      5.9     78.5
$50,000 TO $54,999           11        34      4.0      4.7     83.1
$55,000 TO $59,999           12        19      2.3      2.7     85.8
$60,000 TO $64,999           13        19      2.3      2.7     88.5
$65,000 TO $69,999           14         9      1.1      1.3     89.7
$70,000 TO $74,999           15        11      1.4      1.6     91.3
$75,000 OR MORE              16        63      7.4      8.7    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED            18       120     14.2  Missing
                                  -------  -------  -------
                          Total       846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     726      Missing cases    120

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D21       DISABLED PERSON IN HOUSEHOLD

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label               Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                           1       119     14.1     14.3     14.3
NO                            2       713     84.2     85.7    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED             4        14      1.7  Missing
                                  -------  -------  -------
                          Total       846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     832      Missing cases     14

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D22       WHO IN HOUSEHOLD HAS DISABILITY

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label               Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

RESPONDENT                    1        64      7.6     54.0     54.0
SOMEONE ELSE                  2        46      5.4     38.6     92.6
BOTH                          3         9      1.0      7.4    100.0
                              .       727     85.9  Missing
                                  -------  -------  -------
                          Total       846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     119      Missing cases    727
```

CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
D23       FUNCTION AFFECTED BY DISABILITY

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

SEEING                          1          8      1.0     11.5     11.5
HEARING                         2          2       .3      3.3     14.9
WALKING                         3         42      5.0     57.8     72.7
MENTAL FUNCTIONING              5          4       .4      5.0     77.7
SOMETHING ELSE                  6         16      1.9     22.3    100.0
                                .        773     91.3  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               8          1       .1  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      73      Missing cases     773

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q1        VOTED IN 1988 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                             1        553     65.3     65.8     65.8
NO                              2        287     33.9     34.2    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               4          6       .7  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     840      Missing cases       6

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q2        GONE TO PUBLIC LIBRARY IN LAST YEAR

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                             1        488     57.7     58.2     58.2
NO                              2        351     41.5     41.8    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               4          6       .8  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     840      Missing cases       6
```

```
Q2A       FREQUENCY OF LIBRARY VISITS IN LAST YEAR

                                                           Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

1 TO 5 TIMES                      1        210     24.9     43.5     43.5
6 TO 10 TIMES                     2         95     11.2     19.6     63.1
11 TO 15 TIMES                    3         50      5.9     10.4     73.4
16 TO 20 TIMES                    4         28      3.3      5.8     79.3
21 TO 25 TIMES                    5         18      2.2      3.8     83.1
26 TIMES OR MORE                  6         82      9.7     16.9    100.0
                                  .        358     42.3  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 8          5       .6  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     484      Missing cases     362

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q3        HAS ANYONE GONE TO LIBRARY FOR YOU

                                                           Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                               1        197     23.3     23.4     23.4
NO                                2        647     76.5     76.6    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 4          2       .2  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     844      Missing cases       2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q4        HAVE YOU CALLED LIBRARY FOR INFORMATION

                                                           Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                               1        199     23.6     23.6     23.6
NO                                2        646     76.3     76.4    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 4          1       .1  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     845      Missing cases       1
```

CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
USE       ANY USE OF PUBLIC LIBRARY IN LAST YEAR

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NO                                 0        299     35.3     35.3     35.3
YES                                1        547     64.7     64.7    100.0
                                        -------  -------  -------
                               Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     846      Missing cases       0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q5        FORMAL EDUCATION SUPPORT CENTER

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                      1         12      1.5      1.5      1.5
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                 2          7       .9       .9      2.4
MODERATELY IMPORTANT               3         75      8.9      9.0     11.4
VERY IMPORTANT                     4        743     87.9     88.6    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  6          8       .9  Missing
                                        -------  -------  -------
                               Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     838      Missing cases       8

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q6        PRESCHOOLERS DOOR TO LEARNING

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                      1          5       .6       .6       .6
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                 2         14      1.7      1.7      2.3
MODERATELY IMPORTANT               3        119     14.1     14.3     16.6
VERY IMPORTANT                     4        697     82.4     83.4    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  6         10      1.2  Missing
                                        -------  -------  -------
                               Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     836      Missing cases      10
```

```
Q7       REFERENCE LIBRARY/PERSONAL INFORMATION

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                     1         17      2.1      2.1      2.1
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                2         48      5.7      5.7      7.8
MODERATELY IMPORTANT              3        373     44.1     44.4     52.2
VERY IMPORTANT                    4        402     47.5     47.8    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 6          6       .7  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      840      Missing cases       6

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q8       REFERENCE LIBRARY FOR BUSINESSES

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                     1         24      2.8      2.9      2.9
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                2         82      9.6     10.0     12.9
MODERATELY IMPORTANT              3        265     31.3     32.4     45.2
VERY IMPORTANT                    4        448     53.0     54.8    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 6         28      3.3  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      818      Missing cases      28

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q9       COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTER

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                     1         70      8.2      8.4      8.4
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                2        112     13.2     13.5     21.9
MODERATELY IMPORTANT              3        306     36.2     37.1     59.0
VERY IMPORTANT                    4        338     40.0     41.0    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 6         20      2.4  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      826      Missing cases      20
```

CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
Q10       RESEARCH CENTER

                                                          Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                      1         19      2.3      2.3      2.3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                 2         58      6.8      7.0      9.3
MODERATELY IMPORTANT               3        192     22.7     23.2     32.5
VERY IMPORTANT                     4        557     65.9     67.5    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  6         20      2.4  Missing
                                         -------  -------  -------
                               Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     826      Missing cases      20

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q11       COMMUNITY INFORMATION CENTER

                                                          Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                      1         15      1.8      1.8      1.8
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                 2         44      5.2      5.3      7.1
MODERATELY IMPORTANT               3        232     27.4     27.9     34.9
VERY IMPORTANT                     4        541     64.0     65.1    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  6         14      1.7  Missing
                                         -------  -------  -------
                               Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     832      Missing cases      14

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q12       INDEPENDENT LEARNING CENTER

                                                          Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                      1          6       .8       .8       .8
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                 2         18      2.1      2.2      2.9
MODERATELY IMPORTANT               3        104     12.3     12.4     15.3
VERY IMPORTANT                     4        710     83.9     84.7    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  6          7       .9  Missing
                                         -------  -------  -------
                               Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     839      Missing cases       7
```

```
Q13       PUBLIC WORK PLACE

                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                    1         31      3.7      3.7      3.7
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT               2         68      8.0      8.1     11.8
MODERATELY IMPORTANT             3        305     36.0     36.5     48.3
VERY IMPORTANT                   4        432     51.0     51.7    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                6         11      1.3  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                             Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     835      Missing cases     11

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q14       POPULAR MATERIALS LIBRARY

                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                    1         26      3.1      3.1      3.1
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT               2         78      9.2      9.3     12.4
MODERATELY IMPORTANT             3        294     34.8     35.3     47.7
VERY IMPORTANT                   4        436     51.6     52.3    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                6         12      1.4  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                             Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     834      Missing cases     12

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q15       SUGGESTED ANNUAL SPENDING PER PERSON

                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

$1 TO $20                       10        292     34.5     39.6     39.6
$21 TO $40                      30        224     26.5     30.4     70.0
$41 TO $60                      50        113     13.3     15.3     85.3
$61 TO $80                      70         43      5.0      5.8     91.1
$81 TO $100                     90         35      4.2      4.8     95.8
MORE THAN $100                 110         31      3.6      4.2    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                9        109     12.9  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                             Total        846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     737      Missing cases    109
```

CAUCASIAN AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
Q16       FINANCIAL SITUATION COMPARED TO LAST YR

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

BETTER OFF                      1       208     24.6     24.8     24.8
WORSE OFF                       2       193     22.9     23.0     47.8
ABOUT THE SAME                  3       438     51.8     52.2    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               5         6       .7  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                            Total       846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     840      Missing cases       6

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q17       FINANCIAL SITUATION COMPARED TO NEXT YR

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

BETTER OFF                      1       360     42.6     44.5     44.5
WORSE OFF                       2        65      7.7      8.1     52.5
ABOUT THE SAME                  3       385     45.5     47.5    100.0
RA                              5        36      4.3  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                            Total       846    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     810      Missing cases      36
```

```
ARE       REGION OF COUNTRY

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NORTHEAST                        1         52     13.1     13.1     13.1
SOUTH CENTRAL                    2        130     32.7     32.7     45.8
NORTH CENTRAL                    3         36      9.0      9.0     54.7
WEST                             4        181     45.3     45.3    100.0
                                       -------  -------  -------
                                 Total      399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      399      Missing cases       0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

ASEX      GENDER OF RESPONDENT

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

MALE                             1        192     48.1     48.1     48.1
FEMALE                           2        207     51.9     51.9    100.0
                                       -------  -------  -------
                                 Total      399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      399      Missing cases       0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

ASTR      % OF COMMUNITY WHICH IS HISPANIC

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

HIGH 41%-100%                    1         94     23.6     23.6     23.6
MODERATE 11%-40%                 2        121     30.4     30.4     54.0
LOW 0%-10%                       3        184     46.0     46.0    100.0
                                       -------  -------  -------
                                 Total      399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      399      Missing cases       0
```

HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
AGE       AGE OF RESPONDENT


                                                   Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

                              18          8      2.1      2.2      2.2
                              19          4      1.0      1.0      3.2
                              20          5      1.4      1.4      4.6
                              21          6      1.6      1.6      6.2
                              22         13      3.1      3.2      9.4
                              23         20      5.0      5.1     14.5
                              24         14      3.5      3.5     18.1
                              25         10      2.6      2.6     20.7
                              26          6      1.5      1.5     22.2
                              27         21      5.3      5.4     27.6
                              28          8      1.9      2.0     29.6
                              29          7      1.8      1.8     31.4
                              30         16      4.0      4.1     35.5
                              31          7      1.8      1.9     37.4
                              32          9      2.3      2.3     39.7
                              33          9      2.2      2.2     41.9
                              34         22      5.4      5.5     47.4
                              35          9      2.3      2.3     49.7
                              36         32      8.1      8.3     58.0
                              37         17      4.3      4.4     62.4
                              38          3       .8       .9     63.3
                              39          5      1.3      1.3     64.5
                              40          2       .5       .5     65.0
                              41          5      1.3      1.3     66.3
                              42          1       .3       .3     66.7
                              43          1       .3       .3     67.0
                              44          5      1.2      1.2     68.2
                              45          3       .7       .7     68.9
                              46          6      1.4      1.4     70.3
                              47          6      1.5      1.5     71.9
                              48          1       .3       .3     72.1
                              49          2       .6       .6     72.7
                              50          7      1.7      1.7     74.4
                              51          4      1.1      1.1     75.5
                              52          3       .6       .6     76.2
                              53          5      1.3      1.3     77.5
                              54         17      4.2      4.2     81.7
                              55          2       .4       .4     82.1
                              56          3       .8       .8     83.0
                              57          4       .9       .9     83.9
                              58          5      1.2      1.2     85.1
                              59          3       .7       .7     85.8
                              60          3       .8       .8     86.6
                              61         10      2.5      2.5     89.1
                              62          0       .1       .1     89.2
                              64          1       .4       .4     89.6
                              65          2       .4       .4     90.0
                              66          1       .1       .1     90.1
                              68          1       .2       .2     90.3
                              69          3       .6       .7     90.9
                              70          8      2.0      2.0     92.9
                              71         12      3.1      3.2     96.1
                              72          0       .1       .1     96.2
                              73          3       .7       .7     96.9
                              74          2       .5       .5     97.4
                              75          1       .2       .2     97.6
```

```
AGE       AGE OF RESPONDENT - continued

                            77        1       .2       .2     97.8
                            78        4      1.0      1.0     98.8
                            80        0       .1       .1     98.9
                            84        4       .9       .9     99.8
                            86        1       .2       .2    100.0
                             .        8      1.9  Missing
                                -------  -------  -------
                         Total      399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     392      Missing cases       8

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D2        HISPANIC OR LATINO DESCENT

                                                    Valid      Cum
Value Label                 Value Frequency Percent Percent  Percent

YES                             1       399    100.0    100.0    100.0
                                -------  -------  -------
                         Total      399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     399      Missing cases       0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D3        SPECIFIC HISPANIC DESCENT

                                                    Valid      Cum
Value Label                 Value Frequency Percent Percent  Percent

MEXICAN                         1       129     32.3     32.5     32.5
MEXICAN AMERICAN                2       141     35.2     35.5     68.0
PUERTO RICAN                    3        47     11.8     11.9     79.9
CUBAN                           4        11      2.7      2.8     82.6
OTHER                           5        69     17.3     17.4    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               7         3       .7  Missing
                                -------  -------  -------
                         Total      399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     397      Missing cases       3
```

HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
D4        RACE OF RESPONDENT

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

WHITE                           6         75     18.9     19.0     19.0
BLACK                           7          8      2.0      2.0     21.0
AMERICAN INDIAN                 8          0       .1       .1     21.1
ASIAN/PACIFIC ISL               9          0       .0       .0     21.1
HISPANIC/MEXICAN               12        257     64.3     64.6     85.7
OTHER                          13         57     14.2     14.3    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               3          2       .5  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     398       Missing cases       2
```

```
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D5        EDUCATION LEVEL COMPLETED

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

KINDERGARTEN OR LESS            4          2       .4       .4       .4
1ST GRADE                       6         14      3.6      3.7      4.1
2ND GRADE                       7          3       .7       .7      4.7
3RD GRADE                       8         20      5.0      5.0      9.8
4TH GRADE                       9          3       .8       .8     10.6
5TH GRADE                      10         19      4.8      4.9     15.5
6TH GRADE                      11         25      6.4      6.4     21.9
7TH GRADE                      12          4       .9       .9     22.9
8TH GRADE                      13         11      2.6      2.7     25.5
9TH GRADE                      14         17      4.3      4.3     29.9
10TH GRADE                     15         16      4.0      4.0     33.9
11TH GRADE                     16         41     10.2     10.3     44.3
12TH GRADE                     17        123     30.7     31.1     75.4
SOME COLLEGE                   18         54     13.4     13.6     89.0
ASSOCIATE DEGREE               19          7      1.7      1.8     90.7
BACHELORS DEGREE               20         28      7.0      7.1     97.9
MASTERS DEGREE                 21          2       .6       .6     98.5
PROFESSIONAL DEGREE            22          5      1.2      1.2     99.7
DOCTORAL DEGREE                23          1       .3       .3    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              99          5      1.4  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     394       Missing cases       5
```

```
D6        HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA

                                                        Valid      Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                               1        137     34.2     46.0     46.0
NO                                2        160     40.0     53.8     99.9
RA                                4          0       .1       .1    100.0
                                  .        102     25.7  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     297      Missing cases    102

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D7        IF ASSOCIATE DEGREE, TYPE OF PROGRAM

                                                        Valid      Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM              1          5      1.2     68.2     68.2
ACADEMIC PROGRAM                  2          2       .6     31.8    100.0
                                  .        392     98.3  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 4          0       .0  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases       7      Missing cases    392

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D8        MARITAL STATUS

                                                        Valid      Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

MARRIED                           1        224     56.2     58.9     58.9
WIDOWED                           2         14      3.5      3.7     62.7
DIVORCED                          3         36      8.9      9.4     72.0
NEVER MARRIED                     4        107     26.7     28.0    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 6         19      4.6  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     381      Missing cases     19
```

```
D9        IF MARRIED, LIVING WITH SPOUSE

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                               1       214     53.6     95.4     95.4
NO                                2        10      2.6      4.6    100.0
                                  .       175     43.8   Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total       399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      224      Missing cases      175

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D10       NUMBER OF PEOPLE LIVING IN YOUR HOME

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

                                  1        25      6.3      6.6      6.6
                                  2        92     23.1     24.1     30.6
                                  3        79     19.9     20.7     51.3
                                  4        81     20.2     21.0     72.3
                                  5        43     10.7     11.1     83.5
                                  6        55     13.7     14.3     97.7
                                  7         5      1.2      1.3     99.0
                                  8         2       .6       .6     99.6
                                 10         1       .2       .2     99.8
                                 11         1       .1       .2    100.0
                                 12         0       .0       .0    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                99        16      4.1   Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total       399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      383      Missing cases       16

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D11       NUMBER OF PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN IN HOME

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NONE                              0       259     64.9     72.4     72.4
                                  1        73     18.2     20.3     92.6
                                  2        20      5.0      5.5     98.2
                                  3         4       .9      1.0     99.2
                                  4         3       .7       .8    100.0
                                  .        41     10.4   Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total       399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      358      Missing cases       41
```

```
D12       NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN HOME

                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NONE                             0       183     45.9     51.2     51.2
                                 1        81     20.3     22.6     73.8
                                 2        56     14.0     15.7     89.5
                                 3        26      6.6      7.4     96.8
                                 4        11      2.8      3.1     99.9
                                 5         0       .0       .1    100.0
                                10         0       .0       .0    100.0
                                 .        41     10.4  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                             Total       399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      358      Missing cases      41

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D13       WHETHER RESPONDENT IS A STUDENT

                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                              1        74     18.6     19.4     19.4
NO                               2       309     77.5     80.6    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                4        16      3.9  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                             Total       399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      384      Missing cases      16

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D14       IF STUDENT, TYPE OF PROGRAM

                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

HS OR EQUIVALENT                 1        30      7.4     39.7     39.7
TRAINING PROGRAM                 2         9      2.3     12.2     52.0
COLLEGE                          3        29      7.4     39.5     91.4
GRADUATE/PROF SCHOOL             4         5      1.2      6.3     97.8
OTHER                            5         2       .4      2.2    100.0
                                 .       325     81.4  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                             Total       399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases       74      Missing cases     325
```

HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
D15       PRIMARY LANGUAGE SPOKEN IN HOUSEHOLD

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

ENGLISH                            6        203     50.7     52.2     52.2
SPANISH                            7        108     27.1     27.9     80.1
ENGLISH/SPANISH                    8         73     18.2     18.7     98.8
SOUTHEAST ASIAN                    9          0       .0       .0     98.9
OTHER                             11          4      1.1      1.1    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  3         11      2.8  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                               Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      388      Missing cases      11

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D16       CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

EMPLOYED FULL-TIME                 1        199     49.9     51.9     51.9
EMPLOYED PART-TIME                 2         45     11.4     11.8     63.7
UNEMPLOYED                         3         30      7.6      7.9     71.6
RETIRED                            4         42     10.4     10.8     82.4
NOT IN WORK FORCE                  5         68     16.9     17.6    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  7         15      3.8  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                               Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      384      Missing cases      15
```

```
D17       ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME BEFORE TAXES

                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

UNDER $5,000                       1         20      5.1      6.0      6.0
$5,000 TO $9,999                   2         42     10.6     12.6     18.6
$10,000 TO $14,999                 3         41     10.3     12.2     30.9
$15,000 TO $19,999                 4         44     11.1     13.2     44.1
$20,000 TO $24,999                 5         33      8.2      9.7     53.8
$25,000 TO $29,999                 6         33      8.3      9.8     63.7
$30,000 TO $34,999                 7         29      7.2      8.6     72.2
$35,000 TO $39,999                 8         23      5.8      6.9     79.1
$40,000 TO $44,999                 9         21      5.3      6.3     85.4
$45,000 TO $49,999                10          6      1.5      1.8     87.3
$50,000 TO $54,999                11         19      4.7      5.6     92.9
$55,000 TO $59,999                12          0       .1       .1     93.0
$60,000 TO $64,999                13          3       .9      1.0     94.0
$65,000 TO $69,999                14          1       .3       .4     94.3
$70,000 TO $74,999                15          7      1.9      2.2     96.6
$75,000 OR MORE                   16         12      2.9      3.4    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 18         63     15.8  Missing
                                        -------  -------  -------
                               Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      336      Missing cases      63

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D21       DISABLED PERSON IN HOUSEHOLD

                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                                1         53     13.2     13.8     13.8
NO                                 2        328     82.2     86.2    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  4         19      4.7  Missing
                                        -------  -------  -------
                               Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      381      Missing cases      19

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D22       WHO IN HOUSEHOLD HAS DISABILITY

                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

RESPONDENT                         1         11      2.8     20.9     20.9
SOMEONE ELSE                       2         39      9.8     74.7     95.5
BOTH                               3          2       .6      4.5    100.0
                                   .        347     86.8  Missing
                                        -------  -------  -------
                               Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases       53      Missing cases     347
```

HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
D23       FUNCTION AFFECTED BY DISABILITY

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

SEEING                           1          1       .1      4.4      4.4
HEARING                          2          2       .6     17.6     22.0
WALKING                          3          6      1.4     42.2     64.2
SOMETHING ELSE                   6          5      1.2     35.8    100.0
                                 .        386     96.7  Missing
                                      -------  -------  -------
                             Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases       13      Missing cases    386

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q1        VOTED IN 1988 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                              1        144     36.0     37.1     37.1
NO                               2        244     61.0     62.9    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                4         12      3.0  Missing
                                      -------  -------  -------
                             Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      388      Missing cases     12

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q2        GONE TO PUBLIC LIBRARY IN LAST YEAR

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                              1        207     51.7     51.8     51.8
NO                               2        192     48.1     48.2    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                4          0       .1  Missing
                                      -------  -------  -------
                             Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      399      Missing cases      0
```

```
Q2A      FREQUENCY OF LIBRARY VISITS IN LAST YEAR

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

1 TO 5 TIMES                      1        87     21.9     42.8     42.8
6 TO 10 TIMES                     2        51     12.8     25.1     67.9
11 TO 15 TIMES                    3        15      3.7      7.3     75.2
16 TO 20 TIMES                    4        13      3.2      6.3     81.5
21 TO 25 TIMES                    5         2       .5      1.0     82.5
26 TIMES OR MORE                  6        36      9.0     17.5    100.0
                                  .       193     48.3  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 8         3       .7  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total       399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      204      Missing cases      196

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q3       HAS ANYONE GONE TO LIBRARY FOR YOU

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                               1        89     22.2     22.3     22.3
NO                                2       309     77.4     77.7    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 4         2       .4  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total       399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      398      Missing cases        2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q4       HAVE YOU CALLED LIBRARY FOR INFORMATION

                                                    Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                               1        80     20.1     20.2     20.2
NO                                2       318     79.5     79.8    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 4         1       .4  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                              Total       399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      398      Missing cases        1
```

HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
USE       ANY USE OF PUBLIC LIBRARY IN LAST YEAR

                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NO                              0        154     38.5     38.5     38.5
YES                             1        246     61.5     61.5    100.0
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      399      Missing cases       0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q5        FORMAL EDUCATION SUPPORT CENTER

                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                   1          0       .1       .1       .1
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT              2          8      2.0      2.0      2.2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT            3         16      3.9      4.1      6.2
VERY IMPORTANT                  4        363     91.0     93.8    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               6         12      3.0  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      387      Missing cases      12

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q6        PRESCHOOLERS DOOR TO LEARNING

                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                   1          1       .2       .2       .2
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT              2          7      1.7      1.7      1.9
MODERATELY IMPORTANT            3         20      5.1      5.1      7.0
VERY IMPORTANT                  4        371     93.0     93.0    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               6          0       .1  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      399      Missing cases       0
```

```
Q7        REFERENCE LIBRARY/PERSONAL INFORMATION

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                    1          8      2.0      2.0      2.0
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT               2         19      4.7      4.8      6.9
MODERATELY IMPORTANT             3        124     31.0     32.0     38.9
VERY IMPORTANT                   4        237     59.4     61.1    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                6         11      2.9  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                             Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      388      Missing cases       11

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q8        REFERENCE LIBRARY FOR BUSINESSES

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                    1          4      1.1      1.1      1.1
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT               2         33      8.3      8.5      9.6
MODERATELY IMPORTANT             3         68     17.1     17.7     27.3
VERY IMPORTANT                   4        282     70.5     72.7    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                6         12      3.0  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                             Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      387      Missing cases       12

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q9        COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTER

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                    1         15      3.8      3.9      3.9
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT               2         29      7.2      7.5     11.3
MODERATELY IMPORTANT             3        106     26.4     27.2     38.5
VERY IMPORTANT                   4        238     59.7     61.5    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                6         12      2.9  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                             Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      388      Missing cases       12
```

HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
Q10       RESEARCH CENTER

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                  1          7      1.8      1.8      1.8
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT             2          7      1.8      1.8      3.5
MODERATELY IMPORTANT           3         49     12.3     12.3     15.8
VERY IMPORTANT                 4        336     84.1     84.2    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              6          1       .1  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     399      Missing cases       1

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q11       COMMUNITY INFORMATION CENTER

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                  1          1       .3       .3       .3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT             2         14      3.4      3.4      3.7
MODERATELY IMPORTANT           3         44     10.9     10.9     14.7
VERY IMPORTANT                 4        341     85.3     85.3    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              6          0       .1  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     399      Missing cases       0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q12       INDEPENDENT LEARNING CENTER

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                  1          0       .1       .1       .1
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT             2          3       .7       .7       .8
MODERATELY IMPORTANT           3         15      3.9      3.9      4.6
VERY IMPORTANT                 4        381     95.3     95.4    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              6          0       .1  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     399      Missing cases       0
```

```
Q13       PUBLIC WORK PLACE

                                                        Valid      Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                      1         11      2.6      2.6      2.6
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                 2         23      5.8      5.8      8.5
MODERATELY IMPORTANT               3         66     16.6     16.6     25.1
VERY IMPORTANT                     4        298     74.7     74.9    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  6          1       .3  Missing
                                         -------  -------  -------
                               Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     398      Missing cases       1

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q14       POPULAR MATERIALS LIBRARY

                                                        Valid      Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                      1         12      3.1      3.2      3.2
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                 2         19      4.9      5.0      8.2
MODERATELY IMPORTANT               3        134     33.4     34.4     42.6
VERY IMPORTANT                     4        223     55.7     57.4    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  6         11      2.9  Missing
                                         -------  -------  -------
                               Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     388      Missing cases      11

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q15       SUGGESTED ANNUAL SPENDING PER PERSON

                                                        Valid      Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

$1 TO $20                         10        146     36.5     45.3     45.3
$21 TO $40                        30         74     18.6     23.1     68.4
$41 TO $60                        50         21      5.3      6.6     75.0
$61 TO $80                        70         22      5.6      7.0     82.0
$81 TO $100                       90          3       .8      1.0     83.0
MORE THAN $100                   110         55     13.7     17.0    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  9         78     19.4  Missing
                                         -------  -------  -------
                               Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     322      Missing cases      78
```

HISPANIC AMERICAN SAMPLE

```
Q16       FINANCIAL SITUATION COMPARED TO LAST YR

                                                          Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

BETTER OFF                        1        102     25.6     26.4     26.4
WORSE OFF                         2         96     24.1     24.9     51.3
ABOUT THE SAME                    3        188     47.2     48.7    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 5         13      3.2  Missing
                                         -------  -------  -------
                              Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      387      Missing cases      13

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q17       FINANCIAL SITUATION COMPARED TO NEXT YR

                                                          Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

BETTER OFF                        1        200     50.1     58.5     58.5
WORSE OFF                         2         28      7.0      8.2     66.8
ABOUT THE SAME                    3        114     28.5     33.2    100.0
RA                                5         58     14.4  Missing
                                         -------  -------  -------
                              Total        399    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      342      Missing cases      58
```

```
ARE       REGION OF COUNTRY

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label              Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NORTHEAST                    1         36     12.0     12.0     12.0
SOUTH CENTRAL                2        104     34.7     34.8     46.8
NORTH CENTRAL                3         81     27.0     27.1     73.9
WEST                         4         78     26.0     26.1    100.0
                             9          1       .3  Missing
                                  -------  -------  -------
                         Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      299      Missing cases       1
```

```
OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE

AGE       AGE OF RESPONDENT


                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

                              20          2       .7       .7       .7
                              23          2       .7       .7      1.3
                              25          6      2.0      2.0      3.4
                              26          3      1.0      1.0      4.4
                              27          2       .7       .7      5.0
                              28          4      1.3      1.3      6.4
                              29          5      1.7      1.7      8.1
                              30          4      1.3      1.3      9.4
                              31          4      1.3      1.3     10.7
                              32          2       .7       .7     11.4
                              33          2       .7       .7     12.1
                              34          6      2.0      2.0     14.1
                              35          6      2.0      2.0     16.1
                              36          4      1.3      1.3     17.4
                              37          7      2.3      2.3     19.8
                              38          6      2.0      2.0     21.8
                              39         17      5.7      5.7     27.5
                              40          4      1.3      1.3     28.9
                              41         10      3.3      3.4     32.2
                              42         18      6.0      6.0     38.3
                              43         13      4.3      4.4     42.6
                              44         11      3.7      3.7     46.3
                              45         13      4.3      4.4     50.7
                              46          9      3.0      3.0     53.7
                              47         12      4.0      4.0     57.7
                              48         12      4.0      4.0     61.7
                              49         13      4.3      4.4     66.1
                              50          7      2.3      2.3     68.5
                              51         14      4.7      4.7     73.2
                              52          4      1.3      1.3     74.5
                              53          6      2.0      2.0     76.5
                              54          3      1.0      1.0     77.5
                              55          8      2.7      2.7     80.2
                              56          6      2.0      2.0     82.2
                              57         13      4.3      4.4     86.6
                              58          6      2.0      2.0     88.6
                              59          5      1.7      1.7     90.3
                              60          6      2.0      2.0     92.3
                              61          4      1.3      1.3     93.6
                              63          5      1.7      1.7     95.3
                              64          1       .3       .3     95.6
                              65          1       .3       .3     96.0
                              66          2       .7       .7     96.6
                              67          1       .3       .3     97.0
                              68          3      1.0      1.0     98.0
                              70          2       .7       .7     98.7
                              72          1       .3       .3     99.0
                              77          1       .3       .3     99.3
                              82          1       .3       .3     99.7
                              83          1       .3       .3    100.0
                               .          2       .7  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     298      Missing cases      2
```

```
D2        HISPANIC OR LATINO DESCENT

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                               1          5      1.7      1.7      1.7
NO                                2        294     98.0     98.3    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 4          1       .3  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      299      Missing cases       1

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D3        SPECIFIC HISPANIC DESCENT

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

MEXICAN                           1          1       .3     20.0     20.0
MEXICAN AMERICAN                  2          2       .7     40.0     60.0
PUERTO RICAN                      3          1       .3     20.0     80.0
OTHER                             5          1       .3     20.0    100.0
                                  .        295     98.3  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases        5      Missing cases     295

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D4        RACE OF RESPONDENT

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

WHITE                             6        277     92.3     92.6     92.6
BLACK                             7         13      4.3      4.3     97.0
AMERICAN INDIAN                   8          2       .7       .7     97.7
ASIAN/PACIFIC ISL                 9          2       .7       .7     98.3
HISPANIC/MEXICAN                 12          2       .7       .7     99.0
OTHER                            13          3      1.0      1.0    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 3          1       .3  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      299      Missing cases       1
```

OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE

```
D5        EDUCATION LEVEL COMPLETED


                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

OTHER                            1          4      1.3      1.3      1.3
7TH GRADE                       12          1       .3       .3      1.7
11TH GRADE                      16          2       .7       .7      2.3
12TH GRADE                      17         22      7.3      7.4      9.7
SOME COLLEGE                    18         34     11.3     11.4     21.1
ASSOCIATE DEGREE                19          3      1.0      1.0     22.1
BACHELORS DEGREE                20        100     33.3     33.4     55.5
MASTERS DEGREE                  21         80     26.7     26.8     82.3
PROFESSIONAL DEGREE             22         23      7.7      7.7     90.0
DOCTORAL DEGREE                 23         30     10.0     10.0    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               99          1       .3  Missing
                                      -------  -------  -------
                             Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      299      Missing cases       1

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D6        HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA


                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                              1         25      8.3    100.0    100.0
                                 .        275     91.7  Missing
                                      -------  -------  -------
                             Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases       25      Missing cases     275

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D7        IF ASSOCIATE DEGREE, TYPE OF PROGRAM


                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

ACADEMIC PROGRAM                 2          3      1.0    100.0    100.0
                                 .        297     99.0  Missing
                                      -------  -------  -------
                             Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases        3      Missing cases     297
```

```
D8        MARITAL STATUS

                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

MARRIED                            1        213     71.0     71.2     71.2
WIDOWED                            2          6      2.0      2.0     73.2
DIVORCED                           3         37     12.3     12.4     85.6
NEVER MARRIED                      4         43     14.3     14.4    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  6          1       .3  Missing
                                            -------  -------  -------
                               Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      299       Missing cases       1

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D9        IF MARRIED, LIVING WITH SPOUSE

                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                                1        213     71.0    100.0    100.0
                                   .         87     29.0  Missing
                                            -------  -------  -------
                               Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      213       Missing cases      87

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D10       NUMBER OF PEOPLE LIVING IN YOUR HOME

                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

                                   1         53     17.7     17.8     17.8
                                   2         98     32.7     33.0     50.8
                                   3         59     19.7     19.9     70.7
                                   4         52     17.3     17.5     88.2
                                   5         25      8.3      8.4     96.6
                                   6          8      2.7      2.7     99.3
                                   7          2       .7       .7    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 99          3      1.0  Missing
                                            -------  -------  -------
                               Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      297       Missing cases       3
```

```
D11       NUMBER OF PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN IN HOME


                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NONE                             0        210     70.0     86.1     86.1
                                 1         24      8.0      9.8     95.9
                                 2          9      3.0      3.7     99.6
                                 3          1       .3       .4    100.0
                                 .         56     18.7  Missing
                                      -------  -------  -------
                             Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     244      Missing cases      56

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D12       NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN HOME


                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NONE                             0        118     39.3     48.4     48.4
                                 1         53     17.7     21.7     70.1
                                 2         46     15.3     18.9     88.9
                                 3         21      7.0      8.6     97.5
                                 4          3      1.0      1.2     98.8
                                 5          3      1.0      1.2    100.0
                                 .         56     18.7  Missing
                                      -------  -------  -------
                             Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     244      Missing cases      56

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D13       WHETHER RESPONDENT IS A STUDENT


                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                              1         18      6.0      6.0      6.0
NO                               2        282     94.0     94.0    100.0
                                      -------  -------  -------
                             Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     300      Missing cases       0
```

```
D14       IF STUDENT, TYPE OF PROGRAM

                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

TRAINING PROGRAM                 2          1       .3      5.6      5.6
COLLEGE                          3          3      1.0     16.7     22.2
GRADUATE/PROF SCHOOL             4          9      3.0     50.0     72.2
OTHER                            5          5      1.7     27.8    100.0
                                 .        282     94.0  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                             Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases       18      Missing cases    282

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D15       PRIMARY LANGUAGE SPOKEN IN HOUSEHOLD

                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

ENGLISH                          6        295     98.3     98.7     98.7
ENGLISH/SPANISH                  8          1       .3       .3     99.0
SOUTHEAST ASIAN                  9          1       .3       .3     99.3
OTHER                           11          2       .7       .7    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                3          1       .3  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                             Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      299      Missing cases      1

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D16       CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS

                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

EMPLOYED FULL-TIME               1        278     92.7     93.0     93.0
EMPLOYED PART-TIME               2         12      4.0      4.0     97.0
RETIRED                          4          3      1.0      1.0     98.0
NOT IN WORK FORCE                5          6      2.0      2.0    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                7          1       .3  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                             Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      299      Missing cases      1
```

```
OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE

D17      ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME BEFORE TAXES

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

UNDER $5,000                       1          1       .3       .4       .4
$5,000 TO $9,999                   2          3      1.0      1.1      1.5
$10,000 TO $14,999                 3          4      1.3      1.5      2.9
$15,000 TO $19,999                 4          7      2.3      2.6      5.5
$20,000 TO $24,999                 5          5      1.7      1.8      7.3
$25,000 TO $29,999                 6         14      4.7      5.1     12.5
$30,000 TO $34,999                 7          9      3.0      3.3     15.8
$35,000 TO $39,999                 8         14      4.7      5.1     20.9
$40,000 TO $44,999                 9         25      8.3      9.2     30.0
$45,000 TO $49,999                10         18      6.0      6.6     36.6
$50,000 TO $54,999                11         22      7.3      8.1     44.7
$55,000 TO $59,999                12         12      4.0      4.4     49.1
$60,000 TO $64,999                13         18      6.0      6.6     55.7
$65,000 TO $69,999                14          9      3.0      3.3     59.0
$70,000 TO $74,999                15         17      5.7      6.2     65.2
$75,000 OR MORE                   16         95     31.7     34.8    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 18         27      9.0  Missing
                                        -------  -------  -------
                               Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     273      Missing cases     27

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D21      DISABLED PERSON IN HOUSEHOLD

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                                1         14      4.7      4.7      4.7
NO                                 2        284     94.7     95.3    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  4          2       .7  Missing
                                        -------  -------  -------
                               Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     298      Missing cases      2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

D22      WHO IN HOUSEHOLD HAS DISABILITY

                                                        Valid     Cum
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

RESPONDENT                         1          3      1.0     23.1     23.1
SOMEONE ELSE                       2         10      3.3     76.9    100.0
                                   .        286     95.3  Missing
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                  5          1       .3  Missing
                                        -------  -------  -------
                               Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      13      Missing cases    287
```

```
D23      FUNCTION AFFECTED BY DISABILITY

                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

SEEING                           1          1       .3     33.3     33.3
HEARING                          2          1       .3     33.3     66.7
WALKING                          3          1       .3     33.3    100.0
                                 .        297     99.0  Missing
                                      -------  -------  -------
                             Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases       3      Missing cases    297

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q1       VOTED IN 1988 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                              1        285     95.0     95.3     95.3
NO                               2         14      4.7      4.7    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                4          1       .3  Missing
                                      -------  -------  -------
                             Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     299      Missing cases      1

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q2       GONE TO PUBLIC LIBRARY IN LAST YEAR

                                                       Valid     Cum
Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                              1        250     83.3     83.3     83.3
NO                               2         50     16.7     16.7    100.0
                                      -------  -------  -------
                             Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     300      Missing cases      0
```

OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE

```
Q2A       FREQUENCY OF LIBRARY VISITS IN LAST YEAR

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

1 TO 5 TIMES                   1         99     33.0     39.6     39.6
6 TO 10 TIMES                  2         66     22.0     26.4     66.0
11 TO 15 TIMES                 3         40     13.3     16.0     82.0
16 TO 20 TIMES                 4         12      4.0      4.8     86.8
21 TO 25 TIMES                 5          8      2.7      3.2     90.0
26 TIMES OR MORE               6         25      8.3     10.0    100.0
                               .         50     16.7  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     250      Missing cases      50

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q3        HAS ANYONE GONE TO LIBRARY FOR YOU

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                            1        156     52.0     52.2     52.2
NO                             2        143     47.7     47.8    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              4          1       .3  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     299      Missing cases       1

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q4        HAVE YOU CALLED LIBRARY FOR INFORMATION

                                                      Valid     Cum
Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

YES                            1        175     58.3     59.1     59.1
NO                             2        121     40.3     40.9    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED              4          4      1.3  Missing
                                    -------  -------  -------
                           Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     296      Missing cases       4
```

```
USE       ANY USE OF PUBLIC LIBRARY IN LAST YEAR

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label               Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NO                            0        23      7.7      7.7      7.7
YES                           1       277     92.3     92.3    100.0
                                  -------  -------  -------
                          Total       300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      300      Missing cases       0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q5        FORMAL EDUCATION SUPPORT CENTER

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label               Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT            2         7      2.3      2.3      2.3
MODERATELY IMPORTANT          3        29      9.7      9.7     12.0
VERY IMPORTANT                4       264     88.0     88.0    100.0
                                  -------  -------  -------
                          Total       300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      300      Missing cases       0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q6        PRESCHOOLERS DOOR TO LEARNING

                                                     Valid     Cum
Value Label               Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                 1         2       .7       .7       .7
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT            2         6      2.0      2.0      2.7
MODERATELY IMPORTANT          3        48     16.0     16.0     18.7
VERY IMPORTANT                4       244     81.3     81.3    100.0
                                  -------  -------  -------
                          Total       300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases      300      Missing cases       0
```

OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE

```
Q7        REFERENCE LIBRARY/PERSONAL INFORMATION

                                                             Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                   1          3      1.0      1.0      1.0
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT              2         22      7.3      7.4      8.4
MODERATELY IMPORTANT            3        160     53.3     53.5     61.9
VERY IMPORTANT                  4        114     38.0     38.1    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               6          1       .3  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     299      Missing cases       1

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q8        REFERENCE LIBRARY FOR BUSINESSES

                                                             Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                   1          8      2.7      2.7      2.7
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT              2         29      9.7      9.7     12.4
MODERATELY IMPORTANT            3        121     40.3     40.5     52.8
VERY IMPORTANT                  4        141     47.0     47.2    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               6          1       .3  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     299      Missing cases       1

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q9        COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTER

                                                             Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                   1         19      6.3      6.3      6.3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT              2         44     14.7     14.7     21.0
MODERATELY IMPORTANT            3         99     33.0     33.0     54.0
VERY IMPORTANT                  4        138     46.0     46.0    100.0
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     300      Missing cases       0
```

```
Q10       RESEARCH CENTER

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                   1         12      4.0      4.0      4.0
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT              2         45     15.0     15.1     19.1
MODERATELY IMPORTANT            3         74     24.7     24.8     44.0
VERY IMPORTANT                  4        167     55.7     56.0    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               6          2       .7  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     298      Missing cases      2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q11       COMMUNITY INFORMATION CENTER

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                   1          6      2.0      2.0      2.0
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT              2         19      6.3      6.4      8.4
MODERATELY IMPORTANT            3         79     26.3     26.4     34.8
VERY IMPORTANT                  4        195     65.0     65.2    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED               6          1       .3  Missing
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     299      Missing cases      1

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q12       INDEPENDENT LEARNING CENTER

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                   1          3      1.0      1.0      1.0
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT              2         14      4.7      4.7      5.7
MODERATELY IMPORTANT            3         49     16.3     16.3     22.0
VERY IMPORTANT                  4        234     78.0     78.0    100.0
                                     -------  -------  -------
                            Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     300      Missing cases      0
```

```
OPINION LEADERS SAMPLE

Q13       PUBLIC WORK PLACE

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                     1          9      3.0      3.0      3.0
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                2         48     16.0     16.0     19.0
MODERATELY IMPORTANT              3        128     42.7     42.7     61.7
VERY IMPORTANT                    4        115     38.3     38.3    100.0
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     300      Missing cases      0

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q14       POPULAR MATERIALS LIBRARY

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

NOT IMPORTANT                     1          4      1.3      1.3      1.3
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT                2         26      8.7      8.7     10.0
MODERATELY IMPORTANT              3        111     37.0     37.1     47.2
VERY IMPORTANT                    4        158     52.7     52.8    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 6          1       .3  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     299      Missing cases      1

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q15       SUGGESTED ANNUAL SPENDING PER PERSON

                                                         Valid     Cum
Value Label                   Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

$0                                0          1       .3       .4       .4
$1 TO $20                        10         58     19.3     21.2     21.6
$21 TO $40                       30        101     33.7     37.0     58.6
$41 TO $60                       50         65     21.7     23.8     82.4
$61 TO $80                       70         17      5.7      6.2     88.6
$81 TO $100                      90         14      4.7      5.1     93.8
MORE THAN $100                  110         17      5.7      6.2    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                 9         27      9.0  Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                              Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     273      Missing cases     27
```

```
Q16       FINANCIAL SITUATION COMPARED TO LAST YR

                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                       Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

BETTER OFF                            1         96     32.0     32.2     32.2
WORSE OFF                             2         56     18.7     18.8     51.0
ABOUT THE SAME                        3        146     48.7     49.0    100.0
DONT KNOW/REFUSED                     5          2       .7  Missing
                                           -------  -------  -------
                                  Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     298      Missing cases       2

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Q17       FINANCIAL SITUATION COMPARED TO NEXT YR

                                                            Valid     Cum
Value Label                       Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent  Percent

BETTER OFF                            1        110     36.7     37.0     37.0
WORSE OFF                             2         35     11.7     11.8     48.8
ABOUT THE SAME                        3        152     50.7     51.2    100.0
RA                                    5          3      1.0  Missing
                                           -------  -------  -------
                                  Total        300    100.0    100.0

Valid cases     297      Missing cases       3
```